The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXI NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 24, 1920 No. 2873

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 85

EDITORIALS:

The Third Party Effort 88

The Public Servant 89

Fisher 90

Bolshevism at Middletown 90

Literature and Politics 91

CHRISTENSEN'S CONVENTION. By Arthur Warner 92

THE BRITISH LABOR CONFERENCE. By J. Ramsay Macdonald 94

EPIGRAMS. By Clara Shanafelt and Eda Lou Walton 95

THE BOLIVIAN REVOLUTION AND TACNA-ARICA. By Latinus 96

ON HAMLET AND HAMLETS. By Arthur Symons 97

IMPORTING THE WHITE TERROR. By Eugene S. Bagger 99

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By The Drifter 100

CORRESPONDENCE 101

THE DEPORTED. By Anzia Yezierska 102

THE FEASTERS. By Ridgeley Torrence 102

BOOKS:

My Second Country. By B. U. Burke 103

Philosophers Abroad. By Irita Van Doren 103

Science and Peace. By Benjamin C. Gruenberg 104

Faith and War. By Ludwig Lewisohn 105

The Strategy of the Great War. By X. Y. Z. 106

Man and Mystic. By Glen Mullin 107

BOOKS IN BRIEF 108

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 110

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER ARTHUR GLEASON

LEWIS S. GANNETT

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Adress: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swathmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

WITH rather surprising vigor Senator Harding took the opportunity afforded by the conference between Governor Cox and President Wilson, first, to predict the easily predictable—that these eminent statesmen would find themselves in sweetest and completest accord—and, second, to ask the Governor four questions as to the latter's real attitude toward the treaty. If the Governor answers the questions—and we do not see how he can fail to do so—we shall have a real illumination of the Democratic candidate's stand such as is not obtainable at this writing. Thus, President Wilson's statement issued after the conference, "I found . . . that he and I were absolutely at one with regard to the great issue of the League of Nations . . .," is rather surprising in view of Governor Cox's own statement that he favors certain reservations, and of the declaration of the Democratic platform in favor of reservations that will not impair the "essential integrity of the Covenant." But as Mr. Wilson has refused thus far to accept any specific reservations, we are obviously in need of further enlightenment. Governor Cox may furnish it if he answers Mr. Harding's questions. For instance, does Governor Cox believe that Article X is the heart of the treaty, and will he renew Mr. Wilson's request for a mandate for Armenia, if he is elected President? By all means let us have light on Governor Cox's position, since otherwise the country must feel that the Democrats are once more attempting the familiar dodge of facing both ways. If Senator Harding or anybody else can get a little of the cant, humbug, hypocrisy, and false sentimentality out of this campaign he will do a national service.

AS Mrs. Squeers *consolatrix* would remark to the Dotheboys Hall sufferers, "It will be all the same a hundred years from now." The exact date of women's emancipation will, perhaps, be of slight importance to historians, but is it necessary that America should form the extreme rearguard in the march toward democracy for which it has just made the world safe? Czarist Russia conferred by two years upon the nation "conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are equal" the distinction of being the last on earth to free its slaves. Already in the second section of the world's equal suffrage train, we ought not to covet being the last aboard. Whether it be a Republican Green Mountain or Nutmeg Executive, or Florida's Governor Catts defying Mrs. Catt's wrath, or a Democratic Legislature gravely resolving to enfranchise the—"God bless 'em"—*white* women, is important only in aiding our puzzled future chroniclers to attach a distinguishing tag to the Tweedledum or Tweedledee who, while competing in safe and sane methods of preserving us, forgets that 'tis woman who's the life of the party.

THE Spa conference ended, as we predicted last week would probably be the case, with a compromise on the question of coal and no agreement as to the amount of indemnities. The German representatives were forced to agree to the Allied demand for the delivery of 2,000,000 tons of coal a month, but the obligation is to run for six months only, and during that time Germany will be credited with the difference between the price of coal at the time the Treaty of Versailles was signed and the market price at the time of delivery. These credits, which virtually amount to an Allied loan to Germany, will, it is estimated, aggregate from $60,000,000 to $100,000,000 for the six months' period. The question of reparations was confided to a commission of the principal Allied Powers, on which Germany will be represented. The commission will meet soon at Geneva. The vexed question of how the amounts received from Germany should be apportioned, in regard to which Italy, it will be remembered, had strongly objected to an earlier arrangement, was disposed of by allotting 52 per cent to France, 22 per cent to Great Britain, 10 per cent to Italy, 8 per cent to Belgium, and three-fourths of one per cent to Japan and Portugal respectively. In addition, Belgium receives confirmation of its claim of priority to 2,500,000,000 marks, out of which it proposes to pay various loans from the Allies. Both Mr. Lloyd George and M. Millerand refused to withdraw the provision of the disarmament agreement which they had earlier forced upon the Germans, threatening to occupy the Ruhr or some other part of Germany in case of the non-fulfilment of Germany's obligations, so that further military occupation of the country is possible. It is upon this military provision that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

M. Millerand will probably have to lean heavily to save his face in France, where the proceedings of the conference have been followed with anything but satisfaction by the press. Whether the German Ministry will be able to withstand the criticisms to which it is being subjected is doubtful.

THIS business of invading the Ruhr and assuring the Western world an abundant flow of coal is not so simple as it sounds. In the first place, the Allies may find themselves in the triumphant position of Governor Henry Allen, who made it a crime to strike in Kansas and thereby drove some thousands of coal miners into a strike till then undreamed of. The Allies may occupy the Ruhr, and may proclaim that every Ruhrite shall dig coal, but they are not likely to increase thereby the enthusiasm of the individual miner for his task. In the second place, they will come face to face with the question of hours. German coal miners have been working on a seven-hour day for more than a year; recently, at the special request of the German Chancellor, and in consideration of double pay for overtime and extra rations of bread and fat, they have been induced to work two extra half-day shifts per week. The result has been a considerable increase in total production, although the production per man per hour diminished when the extra shifts were added. The French miners, however, have only recently won the eight-hour day. It is not to be supposed that they will relish the thought that French soldiers are being used to force Germans to work shorter hours than the French. Either they will demand—and get—the seven-hour day in France, or the military authorities will have to attempt to force the German miners to go to an eight-hour schedule. And, entirely apart from the doubtful question of whether or not the German miners at present have the physical stamina to endure such a regimen, it may be difficult to persuade them to dig that extra hour per day. The problem of involuntary labor is still unsolved—both in Kansas and in the Ruhr.

KIEV, Rovno, Lemberg, Minsk, Vilna—these names tell the tale of Polish defeat, of the end of the latest boomerang campaign against Soviet Russia. Along a seven-hundred mile front, against Polish troops equipped with British and American guns and uniforms, fed in part—we are told—by the American Young Women's Christian Association, commanded and advised by some thousand French officers, the soldiers of Russia have pushed steadily on. But the outcome of the story is not yet known. On July 11 the Supreme Council sent to Russia a note suggesting an armistice with Poland, and promised at the same time "full assistance" to Poland if the Russians should refuse. The Poles have felt "obliged to accept" the terms of the proposal, but no answer has yet come from Moscow. If the Poles can bring themselves to look back at the history of the last two years instead of contemplating solely the glories of 1772, they will note the fate of the other "buffers" and "bulwarks against bolshevism." One and all, at the instigation of the Allies, they have attempted the impossible, failed, and then been abandoned by those who led them into the adventure. The job of whipping-boy for Allied imperialism is always open, but it is a thankless task. Whether the Bolsheviki accept or reject the terms advanced to them depends upon whether they covet peace and trade more than military triumph. If the Bolsheviki are willing to make terms of any sort, the Poles would do well to accept them lest in the end they get no terms at all.

THE Third Internationale, now sitting in conference in Moscow, has before it a different world from that which faced it at its birth more than a year ago. The class struggle goes on, the revolution has not been declared a stalemate, but there are signs that Europe is tired, and that the organized workers in each country are hardly up to the stringent requirements imposed by the Russian exemplars of revolution. It is probable that the future of the socialist movement in Europe lies with the Communist Internationale, but it is also probable that that body will have to cease reviling as "yellow" all who have not yielded to Moscow domination over their souls and their politics. With this in mind the proceedings of the present conference should be closely studied; they cannot be dismissed nor minimized with a phrase such as appeared in a recent article in the New York *Evening Post:* "the Moscow Internationale has not succeeded in recruiting into its ranks a single important Socialist group in Western Europe." This is far from true. The Norwegian Socialist Party—an exceedingly powerful organization—has affiliated with the new Internationale, as has the Italian party. A large section of Spanish Socialists has joined. The German Independent Socialists have specifically declared their adhesion to the Moscow organization in the event of their failure to organize a new united Internationale; while two French Socialists are reported to be in Moscow at the present time discussing the possibility of affiliation on the part of the French majority party. Nor can the decision of the Socialist Party of the United States to apply for admission to the Third Internationale be honestly ignored.

THE Allies have spoken stern words to Turkey, and by way of reply it appears likely that the Turkish Government will sign the treaty; then, with the amenities out of the way, the fighting can proceed. How can the Turkish Government, even if its will were good, carry into effect the demands of the Allies? How can it, crippled as it is, assist in the occupation of Thrace and crush the victorious bands of Nationalist soldiers and bandits operating throughout the whole of the former Turkish Empire? Will the Turkish treaty, laughed at or ignored by some of the Allied nations themselves, quiet the unrest in Palestine or Syria or Anatolia or Cilicia? What is to stop the warfare between the Allies and Greeks on the one hand, and the Arabs and Turks on the other? What is to save the Armenians from destruction? What is to prevent the Bolsheviki from dominating the Near East? It is easy to see that the treaty will do none of these things. It is harder to say how they can be accomplished. If a little honest diplomacy were substituted for force, if plebiscites and autonomy were substituted for mandates under the control of greedy imperialisms, there would be some hope of peace in the Near East. Without these the wars will continue—the new and serious war between France and the Syrians has now begun in dead earnest—the Moslem population in India and elsewhere will be inflamed, and thwarted nationalism will still play its bloody part in European politics. Do the Allies understand these things? Is their *realpolitik* truly realistic, or are their minds made stupid by dreams of trade and power?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ROBERT SMILLIE has returned to the leadership of British labor. That is the explanation of the recent vote by the British Trades Union Congress in favor of direct action to force the withdrawal of troops from Ireland and the cessation of munition-making for military operations against Ireland and Russia. The vote does not mean a general strike. It means a series of votes by the affiliated unions, deputations to the Prime Minister, another Trades Union Congress, and, finally, if necessary, a general election. This is the method of the British social revolution. It will please neither Lenin nor Samuel Gompers. The British will continue to be themselves though Europe crumble and the Empire fall. All sections of labor united in a demand for the return of Mr. Smillie to active command. Against the advice of physicians he consented to resume the fight. His presence in the front line had become necessary.

THE British people, including the workers, are tired out by the last six years. They have just enough energy left to be busy with the immediate job. But they have no heart for a strenuous reconstruction or a romantic revolution. In this fatigued and indifferent community, Mr. Lloyd George is securely anchored in power for the present. In recent months, labor has drifted and become incoherent. By the breakdown in health of Robert Smillie and Arthur Henderson it lost its national leaders. Its varied demands in hours and wages will in a few years create a fundamental issue, with a sharp alignment of opposing forces. But meantime the lack of unity was becoming increasingly costly. Labor representatives in Parliament, with a few exceptions such as William Graham and Ben Spoor, proved themselves wanting in policy and weak in debate. The trade unions prefer sending to Parliament a plodding official, harassed by executive demands, to the selection of skilled parliamentarians like Ramsay Macdonald and Philip Snowden. As a result, labor is hopelessly outpointed on foreign and home policy. By the time the present summer arrived, a sense of gathering weakness had spread over the movement, which had begun the year 1919 with a revolutionary strike. It was in this mood that the emergency call went out to Robert Smillie.

THE case of the American people versus the American Woolen Company is now on trial in more ways than one. If the Supreme Court decides that cloth is not clothing, as highly paid lawyers of the American Woolen Company would have it believe, then only the sky need be the limit. The price of wool is already exorbitant; the quality of wool is execrable. And now, during the two busiest months of the year, the mills throughout New England have declared a lockout. The law of supply and demand is cited by officials as the reason, but the man in the street ponders in his heart. He knows that the American people have not all taken to silken raiment to the exclusion of wool. He suspects that if the mills were kept going the law might be made to work his way for once—the supply would be increased to a point where the price might go down. But he also realizes that too large a supply and too small a price would mean less money for Mr. Wood and his friends. Hence the lockout—and business is business. Yet Mr. Wood himself was very nice about it. He gave a great garden party for the working people of his town on the lawn of his New England home. But the meal served was unfortunately not substantial enough to last over long weeks of unemployment. In the organ of the textile trade, the *Daily News Record*, there is perhaps a franker explanation of the present reason for that unemployment than any Mr. Wood may have given his guests:

> It seems more than likely that when conditions do improve an effort may be made to get operatives back in the mill at lower wages and longer hours. Labor leaders say they believe this is planned. It will not be successful, they maintain. But they will not say what is to prevent operatives long out of work and without funds from returning to work at almost any rate of wages and any schedule of hours.

THE dear good Texas judge whose lament over divorce is going the rounds of the press is entitled to sympathy. He has discovered that the number of divorces is increasing—increasing alarmingly, in fact. This, of course, is a great evil. Looking over the thousands of divorce suits which have come before him, however, the judge finds that they are particularly common where the wife in the case has gone into business. Women who stay properly at home and attend to their home duties, the judge has observed, rarely find their way to the divorce court; it is the cares of the business world and the deceitfulness of riches gained in trade that tend to throw them off the moral track. We know exactly how his Honor feels. What he wants is a nice "homey" kind of a wife who will keep the house in order, mend his socks, tidy up his room, look after the children, have dinner and supper ready on time, and think his thoughts after him. It is too bad that even in Texas there should be so many married women who refuse to be satisfied with board, clothes, and tips.

SAMUEL GOMPERS, Warren S. Stone of the locomotive engineers, W. G. Lee of the trainmen, T. V. O'Connor, and Matthew Woll are still officers of the National Civic Federation. It will be interesting to see whether they will continue to remain such without protesting. Ralph Easley, chairman of the Executive Council of the Federation, has given them a splendid opportunity to object. It appears that Mr. Easley took it upon himself to communicate to an official of the United States Steel Corporation an advance copy of a report which a committee of the Federation had had prepared regarding certain liberals in the Inter-Church World Movement. The liberals in question were among those who had prepared the now famous steel report. Mr. Easley, in his letter, suggested that the church and business friends of the official might be interested in the revelations, which included attacks upon members of the Y. M. C. A. and the Federal Council of Churches. "There certainly ought to be no trouble," he said, "in having the loyal American members of the Protestant churches have these men kicked out of their positions, or at any rate put in places where they cannot poison anyone but themselves." A New York *World* reporter, who seems to have seen a copy of the Easley documents, tells us that representatives of the Movement were discussed seriatim, "usually employing their names incorrectly and connecting them indiscriminately with the I. W. W., bolshevism, and similar movements." Some day we may learn what share the Federation played in the rumored proposal to hold back the Inter-Church report on the steel strike and in the subsequent collapse of the Inter-Church Movement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Third Party Effort

DESPITE all the hostile criticism of the idealists who met at Chicago to formulate a domestic policy and a program for honest political and economic reform, the effort to create a third party has not been wasted. The beginning seems at the moment unpropitious, but at least it was a beginning. There is a gain, too, in the national coming together of industrial workers and farmers, even though the first approach is made by comparatively small groups of each. Moreover, every ocular demonstration of the extent of the prevailing unrest helps. Nor do we look upon it as an unmitigated evil that various points of view are to be presented to the electorate. The kindest thing that can be said about our major parties is that they are standing still while the world moves. They are now, save for the Japanese Conservatives, about the most reactionary conservatives on the globe. Between them and the most extreme Communist beliefs there is a wide gulf; but between these extremes there ought to be shock absorbers, and it may be that several such will prove necessary.

On the other hand, the disappointment at Chicago certainly raises the question whether liberalism, as distinct from radicalism, has any future in American political life. Liberalism seems to be dying in England, where the Liberal Party is being well punished for its attitude in going into the war and then fusing with the Conservatives. In Germany the old liberalism of Barth, Richter, and Bamberger has long since been ground to pieces between the upper millstone of Kaiserism and the lower of socialism. In France and Italy one finds the same phenomena. More than that, liberalism where it still exists suffers from the dearth of able leadership. Mr. Asquith has gained nothing in public influence by his return to Parliament; Mr. Lloyd George continues to play the role of Judas to the English Liberals, and some of the finest figures in that party have joined the Labor Party in disgust. Writing in the London *Nation* about the possibility of a future usefulness for the British Liberals, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald, who is now reaping the reward of his steadfast opposition to the war by his extraordinary growth in popularity among British labor groups of all shades of opinion, declares that, "taking the country as a whole, liberalism is held in no esteem, it possesses no confidence, it arouses no expectation; the meetings it holds are so meager in size and so devoid of devotion that they cannot raise the temperature of the halls above zero." There is not in England a single outstanding Liberal leader, distinguished, like Campbell-Bannerman, for faithful devotion to the traditions of the party during the war, who can be thought of as a successor to Mr. Lloyd George.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in the third party gathering at Chicago there was no dominant figure, and that the choice of a national candidate fell upon an unknown man. Senator La Follette comes nearest in this country to the position held in England by Mr. Macdonald; but partly because of unintentional distortion by the Associated Press and positive lying by the press in general, he is still far from receiving, outside of Wisconsin and the States in which the Nonpartisan League has raised the banner of revolt, the recognition which he deserves. Had he been chosen to lead the third party elements we should probably have seen a campaign in those States which would have worried the Republicans a good deal, and this despite Senator La Follette's limitations as a leader and as a campaigner. Very possibly he might have polled a larger vote in the Electoral College than Mr. Taft did in 1912. But the platform adopted by the dominating labor group not only frightened him off, but was criticized by the Forty-Eighters as too extreme, certainly for 1920, as differing too little from the program of the Socialists to make a clear issue, and as going far beyond the fundamentals of abolishing privilege. So the opportunity for a strong third party is still to come. It would not have passed had there been a man with anything like Mr. Roosevelt's popularity to lead, or men like Palmer and Buckner to inspire respect throughout the country as in the Gold Democrats' inspiring campaign in 1896.

Yet we count it a gain that the beginnings of a Labor Party were made at Chicago, however radical the platform and however small the group which carried the day. We welcome this political activity as we shall welcome that of any other of the great labor groups, for we believe that a sound and strong Labor Party would be beneficial to the welfare of the United States. There must be a break-up of our political deeps and a reorganization along both conservative and radical lines. The outworn names used by the old parties as cloaks for their hypocrisy and corruption must be done away with. Every day the present campaign advances makes clearer the sham performance in which the major parties are engaged—the sham of trying to make the American public believe that there is any essential difference between them or their platforms on most issues. After laboring long over the platforms the American Federation of Labor has finally decided that the Democratic Party is a bit more worth while in this campaign than the Republican; but it is entirely characteristic of the political situation that while the Cox papers feature the report as pro-Democratic, the Harding newspapers are able to headline it as anti-Democratic.

The leaders of all three groups that met at Chicago worked honestly indeed. More political experience would certainly have helped them, but they tried unselfishly to serve their country, knowing the while that a hostile press would probably ridicule and misrepresent them. Happily, their sincerity compelled some of the newspapers, like those of Chicago and the *World* and *Times* of New York, to treat the convention seriously and report its doings with more than usual accuracy. Nevertheless, the disappointment is great. But the liberals and reformers who are looking for a nobler and better America than that of the profiteer, the exploiter, and the political imperialist will know how to possess their souls in patience. There is evidence on every hand, in every day's newspapers, that the old system is ruining itself. The economic changes which are making over the world are ceaseless in their advance; when the Governor of New York asks the State to monopolize the milk business, no one can doubt that some politicians are beginning to notice what is going on. There is no ground for ultimate discouragement; the stars in their courses fight for the old traditions of American freedom which, whatever the divergency of economic belief, are at the bottom of the political striving of every group which seeks to better American politics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Public Servant

A MAIN problem of democracy is the creation of the administrator. As industrial democracy extends its area, the need is for ever-increasing numbers of men who will bring to public service the same efficiency and initiative which business men have usually brought to private enterprise. Within the next few decades we shall probably see certain key industries and services pass under public ownership. Who is to run them? For the display of his gifts, the business man has demanded as incentive and reward handsome profits. Unlike the other and productive groups in the community, he has not merely received a salary for his services. The technician, chemist, teacher, electrician, physician, clergyman, social worker, research scientist, artist, manual worker, architect—these and the other creators of values are men who are limited to the wage for which they do the work. Some of them find recompense in the achievement itself. The ambitious among them contend for fame. But they are alike in not basing their life primarily on the profit-making motive.

Accordingly, business men who are witnessing the steady extension of the functions of government into industrial lines, such as the venture of Louisiana into cotton warehousing and of North Dakota into banking and terminal warehouses and similar enterprises, and who read of the demands of Governor Smith of New York that the Legislature put the State into one business enterprise after another, are asking themselves how these governmental industries are to be conducted. Their chief opposition to the nationalization of railways, for instance, is the fear that the railways may be as badly managed by the government as is the postoffice under Mr. Burleson, and with as much red tape and waste as is the army of the United States. Plainly, democracy, if it is going to extend the functions of government, has, among numerous problems which the change going on under our eyes will create, a large one in developing industrial and business administrators in the public service and providing them with the necessary human incentives to make government efficient. If this cannot be done, the new status will certainly be as bad as the old. Hence, anything bearing upon this question of bringing about efficiency in public service is of the utmost moment.

The most important contribution of recent years to this problem of the government servant, the employee of the community, is a statement of Viscount Haldane to the British Coal Industry Commission. Lord Haldane had reorganized the Ministry of War. He had made it possible to mobilize and deliver a brilliantly efficient expeditionary force within a few hours. He had remade a great state department. The problems given to him by the Coal Commission for his opinion were the following: (1) If nationalization is decided upon, is the present civil service, or some remodeling of the present civil service, in a position successfully to cope with the problems facing it in case the coal industry is run nationally? (2) Is it possible to train a body of civil servants fit for rapid and efficient administration? Viscount Haldane's answer, the answer of one who has proved himself one of the great administrators, runs in substance as follows:

"We took young men and put them through a special course of training. Education is of vital importance—special education coming upon the top of a sufficiently generally educated mind. We took the London School of Economics, and with the help of Mr. Sidney Webb we induced them to take in hand the task of training forty administrative officers for us in each year. On these officers later were placed enormous responsibility and a great deal of necessity for devising initiative for themselves. It is quite true the young man has not got what is the great impulse in the business world, the desire to make a fortune for himself, but he has another motive which, in my experience, is equally potent with the best class of men, the desire to distinguish himself in the service of the state. That public spirit and devotion to duty will make him do anything. There is a source which is neglected from which public servants might be drawn."

Lord Haldane then outlined the steps: first, schools with a broad, general basis, not special schools, to develop the mind; then a special course of administrative training, to be attended at about the age of twenty-five or twenty-six. "I am not sure I know anything much better than the kind of atmosphere we had in the London School of Economics. There they were trained in making contracts and in local government, in the law of administration, in railway management. . . . Good salaries do not mean the salaries which rich men require in order to live as rich men. Your general in the army, your colonel, your captain, your admiral in the navy, your commander, live on what the rich man often calls very little indeed, but their reward comes to them in another way. They have social advantages which he has not. They are rewarded by the public, by honors, and by positions which tell. I do not like that being a monopoly of the fighting services. I want to see it extended to the other administrative services of the state."

Mr. Justice Sankey, himself chairman of the Coal Industry Commission, said upon this subject: "I think that the danger to be apprehended from the certainty of the continuance of strife in the coal mining industry [under private ownership] outweighs the danger arising from the problematical fear of the risk of the loss of incentive [in nationalization]. The civil servant has not been trained to run an industry, but the war has demonstrated the potentiality of the existence of a new class of men who are just as keen to serve the state as they are to serve a private employer, and who have been shown to possess the qualities of courage in taking the initiative necessary for the running of an industry."

These are certainly encouraging views, yet they record only a beginning of enlightenment, and that, too, on the other side of the Atlantic. For the situation in America we offer a constructive suggestion: the immediate appointment of a commission headed by ex-Secretary Franklin K. Lane, with Assistant Secretary Roosevelt a member thereof, together with representatives of public employees in Washington and elsewhere, for the purpose of devising proper incentives for energy and enterprise and above all for the democratization of our government service. With the long battle for a retirement pension just won, this is the time to look far ahead and to redeem the government employees from the position which they now hold of being autocratically ruled, and, in the District of Columbia, of being set apart without even that vote which other American citizens enjoy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fisher

JOHN ARBUTHNOT FISHER, former First Sea Lord of the Admiralty, creator in part of the modern British fleet, is dead—thirteen years after he struck out his famous plan of "Copenhagening" the German fleet in peace time. He believed it would be "a sagacious act on England's part to seize the German fleet when it was so very easy of accomplishment in the manner I sketched out to his Majesty." Unfortunately, this ruthless piratical memorandum to King Edward somehow leaked all the way to Germany and the Kaiser. And it contributed its share to the tremors that were rocking the balance of power. Each nation in greater Europe had its Prussians in the last years before Europe fell, and none was more perfect than "Hell Jack" Fisher.

He had the merit of a clear sincerity. What he said and did always contained his full weight. This gave to his conversational and literary style a candor and zest that caused him to be quoted. He threw a full program into a phrase—such a phrase as "Sack the lot." When von Tirpitz proposed the limitation of size of guns and ships, Fisher sent word: "Tell him I'll see him damned first." He saw the future of oil for transport. *"No engineers, no stokers, and no funnels, no boilers. Only a damned chauffeur. The economy prodigious.* But what will it be for war? *Why, all the past pales before the prospect.* I say to McKenna: 'Shove 'em over the precipice, shove.'" Other sentiments of his were: "The Germans are in a blue funk of the British Navy"; "it's quite silly not to make war damnable to the whole mass of your enemy's population"; "when war does come, 'might is right,' and the Admiralty will know what to do"; "we shall have sixteen British dreadnoughts with the 13½-inch gun before the Germans have one." This is the true language of preparedness, of military necessity, of ethical frightfulness.

Fisher believed passionately in the coming European war from as far back as 1905. He worked toward it as earnestly as any German militarist, and finally he and all good Prussians saw their dreams and schemes come true. Knowing that their work had been effectual, Fisher embraced even his enemy in a mystical blood-brotherhood, and wrote to von Tirpitz: "You're the one German sailor who understands war. Kill your enemy without being killed yourself. I don't blame you for the submarine business. I'd have done the same myself, only our idiots in England wouldn't believe it when I told 'em." It would be a gross injustice to the memory of the great sailor to believe that he was bragging. His words were the straight talk of a single strong man to whom the ideas of God, sea power, empire, and the destiny of the British race are of one piece.

Fisher was one of those men of genius who have made Britain great as a "Power." He outguessed his opponents. He had a prevision that was intuitive. He made use of able men for his plans. He shrewdly estimated the value of such men as Mr. Charles Schwab. He was also one of those men of "humor" whose line of salty individualism, wit, and quirks has not failed for several centuries in the story of the British Isles. He clothed his single-mindedness in the whimsical unexpectedness that wins attention. At a ceremony in Westminster, clad in pure white, short, stalwart, he was clearly one of those few who are born to rule idiots, weaklings, and lesser breeds.

Fisher wrote in 1919 his "Memories"—a volume that may become a classic because it clearly states England's dream of world-dominion, because it reveals a salient and distinguished personality, and because it swings a vivacious style. Fisher continues the tradition of the conquerors who could use language as they used weapons of war. He describes his book as "a collection of memories of a life-long war against limpets, parasites, sycophants, and jelly-fish." He dates as of the year 1907 "a long, secret conversation with his Majesty in which I urged that we should 'Copenhagen' the German fleet at Kiel à la Nelson." "It is admitted that it was not quite a gentlemanly sort of thing for Nelson to go and destroy the Danish fleet at Copenhagen without notice, but 'la raison du plus fort est toujours la meilleure'." Because of the failure to Copenhagen the German fleet in peace time "came those terrible years of war, with millions massacred and maimed." The text of Fisher's working life was that "the only thing in the world that England has to fear is Germany, and none else."

Of the dead, Fisher liked Moses, Gideon, and Cromwell, Elijah, Nelson, Cecil Rhodes, Stead, Lord Kelvin, Abraham Lincoln, King Edward, Abdul Hamid. He believed in the life eternal; even the late Pierpont Morgan was not more fervent in his consciousness of the presence of God. He possessed a strong mystical sense. He often quoted these lines as describing his country and his race:

> Time and the ocean and some guiding star
> In high cabal have made us what we are.

Bolshevism at Middletown

ON the evening of December 2, 1919, Mr. Wilfred Humphries, a former Y. M. C. A. and Red Cross worker in Russia, delivered a lecture on Russia at the Berkeley Divinity School at Middletown, Connecticut. The lecture was given at the invitation of the Social Study Club, a student organization, and was open to the public. Mr. Humphries, who had spent eleven months in Russia, appears, in the words of Dean Ladd of the School, to have there "formed the opinion that although, in the first weeks of the Soviet Government, there were atrocities, the Soviet rule is now efficient and humane." Among the lantern-slide pictures shown were pictures of Lenin and Trotzky and the flag of the Soviet Republic. Mr. Humphries had already given numerous addresses before churches, forums, city clubs, conventions, and other meetings, and had, or since has, spoken to college audiences at Vassar, Mt. Holyoke, Amherst, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Smith, Clark, Wellesley, Simmons, Radcliffe, and Harvard.

On December 10 the Middletown *Press* published a garbled account of the lecture, based largely upon the report of an excited woman auditor whose state of mind may be judged by her own remarks that "one picture almost made me scream" and "a friend with me held me down." The newspaper editorial on the subject concluded:

> It is time for action. The trustees of the Divinity School should not hesitate a day to purge the School of the influences at work. When mental poison is being administered the best way to check its effects is to deal quickly with those who secretly inject it into receptive minds. Incidentally it may be recalled that there is a movement to take the school to some larger city. Evidently there is a keen desire for a greater opportunity to spread Bolshevik doctrines. We wonder what the great leaders of the Protestant Episcopal Church think about it all?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Perhaps they are ignorant of what is going on. If so, the *Press* has now enlightened them.

A committee of the Middletown Chamber of Commerce, appointed to investigate the "Americanism" of the School, interviewed a number of persons, but for some reason refrained from consulting either Dean Ladd or any member of the faculty. In the meantime sensational newspaper reports about "Bolshevism at Berkeley" continued to appear. Dean Ladd, in an open letter (unfortunately not published) to the Chamber of Commerce, denied that bolshevism or anything un-American was taught at Berkeley, and vigorously defended the methods of teaching which the School employed. Professor Rice of Wesleyan University, respected and beloved wherever the alumni of that Methodist institution are to be found, wrote to the Middletown *Press* strongly deprecating its "violent attack," and declaring that while he did not hear the lecture, and had no doubt that the lecturer "expressed opinions which I heartily disapprove," nevertheless, "if I was unwilling to hear or read opinions contrary to my own I should mostly avoid public assemblies, seldom venture to go to church, and never read the Middletown *Press*."

Following the request of Dean Ladd, a committee of the trustees was designated by Bishop Brewster to investigate the charges. The report, only an imperfect version of which appears to have been published in the metropolitan press, was delayed until June 14. It is a vicious document which should give every friend of liberty pause. While acquitting the Dean and the faculty of approval "of anything of a violent or revolutionary nature," and finding Dean Ladd's Americanism "beyond question," the committee are nevertheless "satisfied that it would have been much better had the lecture not been given at Berkeley." Mr. Humphries, it appeared from the evidence of Y. M. C. A. members "who know him well," was "a Bolshevik propagandist," and came to Berkeley "under the auspices of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society." The lecture, however, was "only a secondary matter:" "some suspicions against the School" as "the center of radical socialism" "had prevailed for a considerable period." The committee were not able to learn that socialism "in a radical or advanced form" was taught at Berkeley; but they did discover that Dean Ladd had been a member of the executive committee of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, of the Committee of 48, "a political organization with socialistic tendencies," and of the Church League for Industrial Democracy—the latter a society within the Episcopal Church with fifteen bishops among its members.

The report so mingles charges, exceptions, implications, and disclaimers as to make it hard to determine whether the committee think that, on the whole, Dean Ladd and his associates should be acquitted or condemned. But the mischief has been done. While adroitly covering itself at numerous points, the hostile bias of the committee is plain. Freedom of teaching in social matters at the Berkeley Divinity School is for the time being under the ban. The School has been pilloried before the church and the country as a place of social heresy, its financial support has been imperiled, the attendance of students has been jeopardized, and the Dean and his associates have been branded as suspicious persons. Once more "Americanism" has been made the cloak of ignorance and reaction. All that is needed to complete the folly is for the trustees to discharge Dean Ladd and his colleagues; then, perhaps, we shall know how liberty fares in the Episcopal Church.

Literature and Politics

IN relation to politics there are two kinds of authors: those who understand the conflicts of the world far too well to engage in them actively, and those who understand nothing, who defend every popular delusion and rush into turmoil with noisy alacrity. In the first class will be found the poets and seers—Goethe, the great, calm European; Shelley, the essential revolutionary; Arnold and Emerson, who possessed a certain noble shrewdness and sobriety of vision. And at times a critical mind of the first order, like Georg Brandes, will enter this class. Allies and Germans besieged him for his partisanship. His cool and reasoned answers could be summed up in Heine's famous couplet concerning the Rabbi and the Priest. The smaller poets burn with the popular ardors of the hour, but, like other people, they grow mild and rational in time. It is safe to say that Lissauer will not spend his life singing *Hassgesänge*, nor Régnier his in hurling *serments*. It is the second class of writers who, whenever they touch politics, bring literature into disrepute. They do not sing; they are the purveyors of yarns, the crafty and prosaic scribes whom the vast and uninstructed audiences of modern times have raised to a station far above their humble deserts. They have sensibility without vision and the conviction of leadership without inward power. And hence it is they who become the vainglorious tools of diplomats and foreign offices, defending the indefensible, exhibiting throats of leather and foreheads of brass.

The latest exhibit in the dangerous second class is Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Not that the job of what Hazlitt was fond of calling a "government tool" is a new one to him. The great sleuth tracked the Boer mind to its evil lair long ago. But the turn of world affairs has recently shown up his type of mind in peculiar starkness. On May 18, 1918, Sir Arthur in a widely circulated letter declared for the benefit of innocent Americans: "There are no secret treaties of any kind in which this country [Great Britain] is concerned. It has been publicly and clearly stated more than once by our Foreign Minister, and, apart from honor, it would be political suicide for any British official to make a false statement of this kind." Well, the secret treaties in due time were published, and it was then made clear that the Foreign Minister had lied, and the treaties were duly written into the super-treaty of Versailles where they are still busy wrecking the world. So when the tumult and the shouting died down a bit, Sir Arthur was asked to admit his unhappy error. His silence was long and sturdy. Finally he condescended to inform Mr. W. R. Browne, of Wyoming, New York, that it was not his fault, since he was no diplomatist and "had no more knowledge of secret treaties than any other man." Mr. Browne thereupon asked Sir Arthur to permit the publication of a moderate statement to the effect that he, being no diplomatist, had been taken in and had thus unintentionally deluded others. Sir Arthur's reply is an inimitable document: "With equal sincerity and frankness may I beg you, after reading your last letter, to consult some reputable medical man, as I am convinced that your health is not normal." Unintentionally, Sir Arthur has given another illustration of the methods of British propaganda during the war, and of the defense of it even now by men who ought to know better.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christensen's Convention

By ARTHUR WARNER

IT was Christensen's convention from the welter of events —dramatic, picturesque, amusing, pathetic—that filled the sessions out of which a new party has just been evolved in Chicago. This Utah giant emerged through old-fashioned democratic processes. A convention which had assembled with its mind made up to choose La Follette as standard bearer ended by nominating a man not known to a baker's dozen at the outset who without any trace of self-seeking had become its acknowledged leader.

From the standpoint of personality, Parley P. Christensen was the dominating figure in the series of meetings that led to the creation of the Farmer-Labor Party, just as the essential fact of policy was the victory of radicalism over bolshevism. Unlike Bryan in 1896 Christensen came to the front without a dramatic gesture that served to stampede the convention, but by natural selection working as it can when men revert to that kind of political gathering, almost extinct in the country, in which the rank and file determine their own destiny by action from the floor. The convention of the Committee of Forty-Eight, most of whose members were unknown to each other, set the ball rolling by electing Christensen as presiding officer, chiefly, it would seem, because of his bulk and geniality. Towering more than six feet in height and with breadth and depth to correspond, this Westerner instilled the delegates with immediate confidence in him and in themselves. Bland, smooth shaven, and smiling, he stood before them in a Palm Beach suit a kind of pillar of cloud by day, and by a subtle telepathy put himself in contact with the thought of the assembly and helped to make it articulate, with here a flash of humor and there a word of common sense. He calmed excited tempers and resolved intricate situations—careless sometimes of parliamentary rules, solicitous always to seek out what the people before him were trying to do and help them do it.

"It's a law of psychology that when a man lets a crowd heckle him it's his own fault," he told a speaker who was complaining of interruptions. "Quit telling us about your ancestors and get to your point." When the Forty-Eighters' Platform Committee reported that it could not agree with a similar body from the American Labor Party, but the delegates nevertheless insisted upon merging, Christensen by his unerring grasp of situations and his quick decisions saved the meeting from chaos. A few hours later, at Carmen's Hall, he saved the United Labor and Forty-Eight Convention from disruption, the two bodies having simply merged, without any arrangement as to organization or procedure. The love feast had scarcely begun before jealousy and controversy broke out. Even under the best conditions a thousand or so persons are too many for a deliberative assembly. Presently half a hundred persons were shouting, gesticulating, and swarming the aisles, demanding recognition. J. A. H. Hopkins, who was presiding, lost control of the situation and turned the gavel over to Max Hayes, of the labor forces. Hayes failed to quell the tumult and finally voices began to call for Christensen. He was hurried to the front platform: he raised his hands, said a few smiling stentorian words and there was order again. For the rest of the afternoon he stood between the assemblage and uproar. He was arbitrary at times—he admitted it—but it was in executing the will of the gathering, not in thwarting it. Tom Mooney's brother had been speaking from the platform in favor of a resolution on behalf of the prisoner. Suddenly Christensen sensed that the meeting, though sympathetic, had heard enough. "Carried," he shouted, short-circuiting the usual parliamentary procedure, and waived the astonished speaker to the floor.

"Is that too much steamroller?" he asked a moment later, pausing to get the feeling of the meeting before railroading through some perfunctory business. But in spite of his demurring good nature and ability, he was not immune from criticism and at one point halted proceedings for a word of personal explanation: "Somebody says I am a plute because I am wearing a Palm Beach suit. I want to say that I bought this suit five years ago for seven dollars and fifty cents."

Christensen comes from Salt Lake City, where he has made a reputation as a lawyer, particularly in criminal practice and has defended numerous labor men without regard to fee. He was formerly a Republican but went into the Progressive Party with Roosevelt in 1912. He voted for Wilson in 1916. According to members of the Utah delegation in Chicago, Christensen has for some years considered his life and interests so identified with those of the workingman that he has held aloof from the professional and commercial organizations of his community, having kept out even of their social clubs. He is, however, prominent in fraternal organizations, an Odd Fellow, and an Elk. He was born in Idaho forty-nine years ago, is a graduate of Cornell University and unmarried. Christensen came to the front at Chicago as La Follette receded. The Forty-Eighters and the Labor Party represented two different ideas at least so far as the majority in each was concerned. The first sought political reform; the second, economic reconstruction. "Not more laws but more liberty," demanded Allen McCurdy in his keynote speech to the Forty-Eighters. The restoration of civil rights was their chief demand, their hope was for a leader and their faith was for victory next November. The Labor Party was not less insistent for the return of civil liberty, but it could see no hope of securing it except through attacking the industrial system that has come to control political action. It distrusted the method of looking for a leader and formulating a platform to conform to his ideas. It proposed to lay down principles and wait until they produced their own champion. It was less concerned with the result next November than in building a party for subsequent years.

These differences appeared in the physical aspects and in the spiritual atmosphere of the two conventions before they merged as one. Among the Forty-Eighters one observed the presence to a striking degree of faces that stamped the personalities behind them as belonging to that high-minded, finely conscientious type that formed the ideals of our earlier America. They had been stung to protest by Palmerism, Burlesonism, Wilsonism, and other governmental autocrats of recent years. Their meeting had a religious fervor. The first session opened with the singing of "The Star-Spangled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Banner" followed by prayer, yet they seemed to be persons whose lives had been isolated from the great struggle between capital and labor which has been the economic background and the fundamental reason for changed political conditions in the United States. The Forty-Eighters to a large extent had the spirit of '76 but not of 1920.

The Labor Party convention, so long as it remained separate, had a different character. It did not open with song or prayer, although it began on Sunday morning while the Forty-Eighters were adjourned until Monday. It opened like the business gathering that it undoubtedly was. Here were hard-handed, hard-headed practical men who had come to their political and economic ideas through experience. They were leaders among their own kind and had come to the front largely because of their fighting or administrative skill. They were the captains of industry on the side of labor, men unemotional, unimpressionable. Presently they were joined by another of the same type, John Fitzpatrick, head of the Chicago Federation of Labor, and prominent in the counsels of recent big strikes. His was the keynote speech. It was halting and uninspiring while he talked of generalities. Then suddenly he began to speak of recent labor troubles in which he had had part and the bear changed into a tiger. He snarled and roared, the perspiration dripped from his face, and one side of his collar caved in while he pleaded: "Oh, that the workers of the United States would concentrate their efforts so they could do a job like Russia."

Such were some of the differences between the two conventions, accentuated by the reiteration (for which outsiders were largely responsible) that the Committee of Forty-Eight was there to supply the intellectual leadership of whatever new party might be possible on the other hand. There was one single strong force working toward amalgamation, the desire for La Follette that was undoubtedly in the minds of a majority of both the labor delegates and the Forty-Eighters. This force prevailed, but a wrong psychology had been created in advance of it, one of suspicion and doubt. When the announcement came that La Follette did not wish to have his name placed before the convention, it could not fail to take the spirits out of the amalgamation movement. Right on top of this, unhappily, came the report of the platform committee, which threw into stark relief the gulf in the convention just at the moment when the hope of a bridge disappeared.

In their actual content there was not enough difference between the majority and the minority reports to worry anybody. Had La Follette been willing to run on either platform, it would have been acceptable to virtually the entire convention. Gilbert Roe, spokesman for La Follette at the convention, told the next day why the Wisconsin Senator had refused to run. In the first place, the platform committee had reached its decision so late that La Follette had not been able to see in person, much less to study, either the majority or minority declarations. But more important than that, said Mr. Roe, the Senator could not convince himself that the joint convention represented a real unity of purpose or a movement that would survive a single election.

There were assertions made at the convention that La Follette was for government ownership but not for democratic control and that he did not want a plank guaranteeing civil rights to the Negro. These assertions, it became evident later, were due to a misapprehension of the facts, but they added to the tension of the convention which, with La Follette eliminated, resolved into a straight contest between the liberals and the radicals, using those words in their common acceptation, the first including those who seek political reform, and the second those who demand economic reconstruction. Judged by other contemporary standards, the radicalism demanded at Chicago was mild. The majority report on platform asked, among other things, the recognition of Ireland and Russia, for no conscription military or industrial, and no compulsory military training. It called for public ownership and democratic control of natural monopolies and the repeal of the Esch-Cummins Railroad Law. It advocated national and state owned banks and direct income taxes rather than consumption and other indirect taxes. It demanded land taxes sufficient so that property should not be held out of use for speculation.

The minority report was more of a political than an economic document but it covered most of the same ground, except the plank for national and state owned banks. The real trouble with the minority report from the labor standpoint was not so much its content as its signers and indeed its mere existence. It was put forward by George L. Record, Amos Pinchot, and Gilson Gardner, three of the five members representing the Committee of Forty-Eight. The majority report was signed by all five of the Labor members. Thus a direct issue was raised between labor and the Forty-Eighters. Robert M. Buck, editor of the *New Majority*, and head of the labor members of the platform committee, took the floor and said that their demands had been whittled down one after another until "we got to a spot where we said: 'by God, we won't compromise any longer.'" Actually the line to which the radicals receded was about the same as the one to which the liberals were willing to advance, but such opposition had developed in the skirmish that neither could see each other for the smoke. The radicals won on the vote, the minority report going down to defeat 308 to 125.

It would be pleasanter to end the story of the convention here, but a call was issued that evening for a separate session of the Committee of Forty-Eight the next day at the original headquarters. There is some doubt whether there was any Committee of Forty-Eight at the time—whether it had not lost its identity as such by merging with the convention of the Labor Party. In any event many of the delegates had gone home before the old convention was resumed the next day. A substantial number were satisfied with the platform and candidate of the Farmer-Labor Party. Others were not, but decided to take their medicine and say nothing. Even at the gathering when it first assembled in the morning, there was evidence of a considerable sentiment in favor of sticking by the Farmer-Labor Party, but the atmosphere was not congenial for such expression and one by one most of the delegates of that opinion withdrew. Late in the afternoon a committee came in, and after recalling the original objects of the Committee of Forty-Eight recommended that "not having fully accomplished this purpose" the Committee should continue its organization and the national executive committee should have power to call another convention should it seem desirable. This resolution was carried by viva voce vote without opportunity for amendment or debate—although not without protest—and the meeting adjourned.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The British Labor Party Conference

By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD

London, July 7

IN every way the greatest conference ever held by the British Labor Party has just finished its sittings at the somewhat fashionable watering place of Scarborough. There were something like 1,200 delegates present, about one-fourth of whom came from the local parties and the remainder from the trade unions and Socialist societies. The former group contained a large element of new people, and it was interesting to hear the tones of the English public school and university following in debate the burr of the Northern miner or the Doric of the Clyde worker. Modestly, in the midst of a row of working-class delegates, sat one of our titled folks bearing a name that was brought over by the Conqueror. There, massed in front of us who were on the platform, was the proof positive that the Labor Party is no longer a class affair, but has appealed with success to the intelligence of all classes.

The varied teams pulled well together. Before the meeting, some of our newspapers brought out their annual stunt that Scarborough was to see devastating disagreement. Scarborough displayed energetic unity and evangelical harmony. It settled once and for all that the Labor Party is a great national political movement with principles and a policy which justify its claim to be considered as a governing party. War divisions have gone absolutely. The war Right has moved over to the Left, which finds its ideas and proposals becoming the unanimous finding of the whole party. The men who stood solitary in these conferences four years ago led easily in Scarborough. Not only did they enjoy a monopoly of personal tributes (not a new thing), their lead was accepted and by great majorities they had their way. Cotton remains somewhat conservative, but the miners and the railway workers are a solid Left block. The new formidable combination of unskilled labor still lacks good leadership and is in the hands of men who were swamped by the war, have become very respectable, and so may remain swamped. The great bulk of the local party representation is Left. One small section of the Socialists—the British Social Party—represents Moscow, but the great overmastering section—the Independent Labor Party—repudiates both Moscow and Geneva and occupies common ground with the French Socialist Party and the German Independents. In some Labor Party hearts there is still something like jealous enmity against this powerful political Socialist party, but that enmity cannot lift its head at these conferences now. That Denikin kind of counter-revolution within the Labor Party is now scotched and will soon be forgotten. It is important that American readers should understand where the center of gravity of the Labor Party is, and Scarborough left that matter in no doubt.

Another important question is: "What is the party's position in the international movement?" This question includes: "By what method does the party propose to gain its ends?" At present the party is affiliated to the Second International and two resolutions were debated proposing a change. One was that the party should join the Third, and the other that it should simply break its connection with the Second. Both were defeated, the first by 2,940,000 to 225,000, the other by 1,010,000 to 516,000. The meaning of this is that the Labor Party definitely declares that it will neither aid nor abet revolution by violence, nor does it enter into its head to seize power except by democratic means. The Russian social revolution is not the only way by which Socialism can come; the Soviet is not the only way by which the proletariat can rule. The British Labor Party at Scarborough put itself at the head of the democratic Socialist movement. It was as determined as any Third International group, that Allied hostility to Russia should cease and that Russia should not be hampered by outside interference in choosing its political and social forms of government, but at the same time it set itself up quite definitely as the exponent and champion of a method of Socialist advance in sharp conflict to that advocated from Moscow.

But while it took up this attitude it remained realist. It is not to create an imaginary world from bricks of logic. There it was faced by a Government that is as independent of public opinion as King Charles I, a Government that gets an overwhelming majority upon issues that were always humbug and are now confessedly so, a Government that uses that majority to make wars and embark upon policies irrespective of the national will, a Government whose conception of democratic control is that, from the moment that election results are declared until the Parliament is prorogued, majorities are absolute and unrepresentative. We are in a worse fix than even that, for we have ministers whose words are but wind and upon whose statements no reliance can be placed. Is a constitutional party, a party that believes in organic transformation, deprived, by reason of its principles, of every swiftly acting weapon which it might use to curb the autocratic power of such a government and counteract the work it does in violation of parliamentary methods? The Labor Party says: "No," but in saying "No," it makes it clear that this action—as when the dockers refused to load the "Jolly George" with munitions for Poland—is exceptional and can be justified only when taken against those underhand policies inaugurated by self-will and by a wanton disregard of the responsibility of ministers to a sovereign people. The mere schoolman will, I know, make havoc with this departure on the part of the Labor Party from strict parliamentary methods and with this engrafting of revolutionary action upon parliamentary stems. But the Labor Party has political practical sense for its justification and that is all that it cares about. In the development of policy, time is everything. The Labor Party may protest in Parliament, but if the Government is allowed to commit the nation, the leaf follows the bud, the flower the leaf, and the fruit the flower, and no man can stay the evolving process. The Labor Party must stay the hand of the sower of the tares, and to do that it is willing to support "direct action" if everything else fails. But, varying the simile, this is a medicine for an ailing body, not a food for a healthy one.

When considering this problem, the Scarborough Conference was met with a difficulty of a temporary, it is to be hoped, but a troublesome nature. Its parliamentary representatives as a team are conspicuously inadequate. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost complete failure of Mr. Asquith since his return to Parliament has alone prevented the total eclipse of the Labor Opposition. In an article already published in *The Nation*, I explained the unfortunate attitude of the cotton operatives in filling in a candidate for the Nelson bye-election. The selection has since been made and a candidate was chosen so ill adapted for the position that during the contest he failed completely to rouse any interest and his election meetings were a series of dead failures. This is the secret of the weakness of Labor in Parliament. The Conference was greatly disturbed by this, but it could not censure its parliamentary representatives without damaging the movement and the press was there for spicy titbits. It resolved, however, by 1,813,000 votes to 832,000 that "the time had arrived for developing a greater efficiency on the part of the Parliamentary Labor Party" and requested "bodies affiliated to the party to make such arrangements as will permit their parliamentary representatives to give continuous attention to their duties in the House of Commons." The academic advocates of industrial Parliaments would do well to study the experiences of the British Labor Party. The recommendatory ending of this resolution does not touch the real point, though, if carried out, it would bring a minor improvement.

Unsatisfactory as the parliamentary party may be in breadth of vision and in resource, the Conference itself was lacking in neither. No matter what was the subject under discussion there were delegates present who were masters of it and whose contributions to the debates kept the discussions on an admirably high level. Men who had been in Russia, in Hungary, in Poland, in Germany spoke on the international resolutions; men who had been in India, in Egypt, in the Dominions, spoke on the imperial ones; men who were leaders of trade unions, chairmen of municipal bodies, responsible for administration, spoke on industrial and domestic ones. No other British political party could have brought under one chairmanship such a body of delegates. From the opening on Tuesday morning till the closing late on Friday afternoon, I sat looking upon a crowded and an intent hall and listening to debates kept upon the highest possible level of importance and to speeches rich in their matter and accomplished in their delivery. Applause was given generously to what was nothing but sentiment; votes were given rigidly to what was nothing but common sense. There was no narrow class interest displayed; the subjects were related to world affairs and were in proportion to their importance; a unity of idea ran throughout.

The Scarborough program was a Labor manifesto to the nation and the world. In the forefront were International concerns—the revision of the Peace Treaty so as to settle the conflicts of Europe and put the nations on their feet again; the recognition of the Russian Government; the ending of all intrigues directed against foreign states and of interference in their affairs by military missions; the denunciation of all secret agreements; economic arrangements to deal with the famine in Central Europe; the reconstruction of the League of Nations. It resolved to send a deputation to the Prime Minister to bring before him the results of the investigation which the party's representatives have made in Hungary, Russia, and Finland. In the affairs of Empire, it pinned its faith to self-determination as a fundamental, though not absolute, principle and accepted as a rule of statesmanship that governments, whether in India, Egypt, or Ireland, should have national assent. It condemned the Amritsar shootings, but insisted that the civil authorities were responsible, that the military criminals should not be made the scapegoats to carry the sins of others, and that the Viceroy should be recalled.

On domestic matters it made declarations on several minor matters important here but of no interest abroad, but it reaffirmed its belief that the continued existence of an enormous debt was a menace to national placidity and a means of grievous oppression and that the debt could be dealt with only by the conscription of wealth. It stood by nationalization of industries and services like mines, railways, canals, and electric power, but it rejected the nationalization of the liquor traffic. Curiously enough, the body which brought about this defeat was the Socialist Independent Labor Party. We are no dogmatists here, and whatever may guide us it is not the mental servility of verbal consistency. A battle royal raged round this question, the Independent Labor Party speakers dealing the decisive blows, and prohibition was rejected by 2,603,000 votes to 472,000, public control by 1,672,000 to 1,352,000, while the Independent Labor Party resolution in favor of an extended form of local option was carried by 2,003,000 to 623,000. On housing the Conference called for the resignation of Dr. Addison, the Minister of Health, state loans for building, the control of building material, and the encouragement of direct labor, together with an increased hygienic standard of houses. One of the greatest difficulties which face housing projects was pointed out by a Glasgow delegate who produced official figures showing that on a typical working-class house built before the war the interest on capital was £8 per annum, whereas the same house built now would have to bear £60 for interest.

Sanity and courage, practical capacity and well-defined principle ruled the Conference. Its voice was the voice of constitutionalism and organic change speaking in the midst of revolutionary conditions. From beginning to end it was the deliberations of men who are largely responsible for municipal government and who are ready at a moment's notice to take over the control of national affairs.

Epigrams

By CLARA SHANAFELT

It is easy for you, daffodil,
For you, young cherry with your polished stem;
In me was not set so clear a sense
Of my identity.

Leaning over the curb
With a gesture of supreme grace,
And of supreme indifference,
An ash tree remembers the forest.

By EDA LOU WALTON

Your mind
Is not the clear spring
I thought it,
And though its waters
Are blown clean again
By hill-winds,
I am ashamed
Of my reflection.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bolivian Revolution and Tacna-Arica

By LATINUS

THE war that Chile fought from 1879 to 1883 against the Peru-Bolivian alliance was ended with respect to Peru by the Treaty of Ancon, and with respect to Bolivia by a truce converted into a peace treaty in 1904, but the dispute with regard to the Pacific seacoast persists. It still threatens wars and causes revolutions. Peru is now appealing to the League of Nations for its settlement, while Chile stands pat upon the Treaty of Ancon and her present possession, and Bolivia is thrown into revolution by the struggle between the pro-Peruvians and the pro-Chileans.

According to the Treaty of Ancon, Chile waived all pecuniary indemnity and obtained from Peru the perpetual and unconditional surrender of the province of Tarapaca, where the Chileans had had valuable industrial interests for many years. She also obtained temporary control of Tacna and Arica, small provinces of no great value, which were to remain in the power of Chile for a period of ten years, at the end of which time a plebiscite was to decide whether the territory was to remain under Chilean control or be returned to Peru, the successful nation paying the sum of ten million "silver pesos" or Peruvian "soles" to the loser of the plebiscite. In order to effect the plebiscite, the treaty stipulated that in a separate protocol the parties should decide upon the procedure to be followed; that is to say, an agreement should be reached regarding who should vote, how they should vote, and under what circumstances.

From this it will be clearly seen that the plebiscite could take place only after the two nations, in common accord, had fixed the conditions. During the intervening years Chile hoped to be able to Chileanize the territory so that the plebiscite would result in her favor. At any rate it must be considered a diplomatic blunder and a serious misunderstanding on the part of the negotiators, not to have determined at the time the basis for the plebiscite nor provided for the provinces affected in case no satisfactory conditions for the plebiscite should be arranged.

The treaty as formulated favored Chile because it left her the recourse of legitimately maintaining Chilean control over Tacna and Arica so long as an agreement was not reached for holding the plebiscite. When the period of ten years was nearing a close, both governments began diplomatic negotiations for drawing up the additional protocol but never arrived at a satisfactory conclusion. While Peru demanded that only the natives should be allowed to vote, Chile was of the opinion that the voting privilege should be extended to the natives, the Chileans, and the foreigners, with certain common restrictions as to residence and civil rights.

Many and varied diplomatic negotiations were carried on at one time or another for twenty years. The governments went as far as signing a tentative agreement known as the "Billinghurst-Latorre" agreement which came to naught in the Chilean Parliament. They also tried to make some arrangements for compensation and determination of the boundary line upon the basis of dividing the disputed territory instead of effecting the plebiscite. Chile has offered Peru commercial advantages and in addition the construction of a railway from Santiago to Lima, with other minor compensations. She also had the idea of purchasing the provinces outright and doubling the amount of the indemnity. All these negotiations have failed, sometimes because Peru had no hope of the plebiscite resulting in her favor and at others for the reason that Chile had not satisfied all the Peruvian aspirations. On both sides there has been an ardent desire to acquire the provinces, Chile, however, being more interested as her original intention had been to conquer them and insure her national territory against future aggression. On the other hand, Peru has staked her pride on their recovery and that ambition serves as an axis for her domestic and foreign policy. The Peruvian officials, like Billinghurst, who have shown their willingness to negotiate with Chile, have been the target of the revolutionary action of the opposing party. The people of Chile believe that these provinces must be definitely annexed to the country, or at least that their northern frontier must be secured.

The Chilean-Peruvian diplomatic relations received a serious jolt in 1909, because of an unpleasant incident brought about by Peru's refusal to accept from the Chilean Minister, Mr. Echenique, a wreath the government of Chile wished to place on a monument erected to the heroes of the war of 1879. The breach was widened when the counter propositions of the Peruvian government frustrated the efforts of the last Chargé d'Affaires of Chile in Peru, Mr. Perez Canto, and later, of the Chilean Minister of Foreign Relations, Mr. Edwards, who tried to make their plan for settlement acceptable, and the rupture in relations occurred in 1910. The immediate cause of the break was the expulsion from Tacna and Arica of some Peruvian priests who had assumed a hostile attitude toward Chile and the Chilean laws. One of the recent proposals rejected by Chile was that of the Peruvian President Billinghurst to postpone the plebiscite for twenty-one years, a period that Chile considered exaggerated and one that delayed the solution of the problem more than was expedient.

The situation created by this severance of relations has subsisted to this day, with evident detriment to both countries. Now Peru desires to have the matter adjusted by the League of Nations while Chile stands firm by her decision to comply with the Treaty of Ancon, which is to have the plebiscite take place. A new phase of the question has come up with the determination of Bolivia to interpose a kind of third claim upon Tacna and Arica and with the prevailing idea among various leading Chileans that Bolivia should acquire an outlet to the sea through these territories.

By the peace treaty of 1904, Bolivia definitely ceded in favor of Chile all her rights to the coast province of Antofagasta, which for many years before the war had been a bone of contention between the two nations until Chile withdrew her claims by the treaties of 1866 and 1874. This was done in exchange for permanent guaranties for the Chilean industrials who exploited the saltpeter in Antofagasta in the same way that the Americans work their oil interests in Tampico, Mexico. When Bolivia ignored these treaties and placed new restrictions upon the Chilean workers, going so far as to confiscate the property of the Compañía de Salitres of Antofagasta, Chile declared the pacts void and renewed her territorial claims to that region. The war which followed and which Peru entered only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because she was allied with Bolivia by the secret treaty of 1873, ended with unconditional surrender by Bolivia and the recognition of the right of Chile to rule over Antofagasta. Thus Bolivia lost her coast.

In 1895 two peace treaties between Chile and Bolivia were signed, which were not ratified, however, but by which Chile gave Bolivia the assurance that she would give her a port in Arica should the plebiscite result in her favor. Chile has at different times expressed her willingness to grant Bolivia some maritime facilities. The truce treaty with Bolivia was extended until 1904, when the final peace treaty was signed and ratified. The transfer of Antofagasta was confirmed and, in exchange, Chile agreed to construct a railroad for Bolivia, connecting La Paz, the Bolivian capital, with the port of Arica, to grant her free customs house privileges, similar to those enjoyed in the ports of Antofagasta and Mejillones. Chile built the railroad within the time stipulated and it is the shortest route of communication Bolivia has to the sea. Peru protested against this covenant, contending that Chile had no right to exercise acts of authority in the territory of Arica.

The question of Tacna and Arica has passed through a crisis during the last fifteen months, because of Peru's determination to regain the territory through Allied mediation, without recognizing the Treaty of Ancon with its plebiscite. Things became so tense that it was feared a new war would break out in that part of the American continent. Chile has continued to uphold the validity of the Treaty of Ancon, and Peru to demand arbitration through the League of Nations. Chile says the way to settle the question is either by plebiscite or a direct adjustment between Peru and Chile, and has refused to accept mediation by any other Power or Powers. Never during the whole controversy has there been a more deep-rooted discord than from 1915 to this date. Since Peru broke diplomatic relations with Germany while Chile remained neutral, the neutrality of Chile was presented by propagandists as a demonstration of Chile's Prussian sympathies and from that moment Tacna and Arica became the Alsace-Lorraine of South America.

Meanwhile, Bolivia launched a vigorous policy to acquire the port of Arica for herself, by promising compensation to Chile and Peru if they gave up their claims in her favor. Peru categorically refused to recognize the Bolivian pretensions, maintaining besides that Chile could not enter into any negotiations with Bolivia, as the territory of Tacna and Arica was Peruvian. In Chile the current was favorable toward Bolivia, while the hostility in Bolivia toward Peru was increased by a note sent to Bolivia by the Peruvian Government, in which Bolivia was warned that Peru could not accept her aspirations in Arica.

The latest chapter in this involved story of claims and counter-claims is the revolution in Bolivia which has ousted Gutierrez Guerra from the presidency, and brought Bautista Savedra into leadership. Gutierrez Guerra was largely responsible for the pro-Chilean policy pursued by the Bolivian Government in recent years, and Savedra belongs to a party which has long maintained that Bolivia should receive from Chile, not a port which Chile took from Peru but a port in Antofagasta, which Chile took from Bolivia. The revolution, if permanent, means a realignment of the republics, Bolivia allying herself with Peru in the demand for mediation by the League of Nations. Peru holds that the dispute is "a circumstance affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace" and so a proper concern of the League of Nations by virtue of Article XI.

It is unlikely that the government of Chile will materially change its position because of any shift in Bolivian policy. Chile insists that the Treaty of Ancon must be fulfilled, and that she is ready to carry out the plebiscite under fair terms. She feels confident that the present outcome of such a plebiscite would favor her claim. Moreover, she holds not only Antofagasta, taken from Bolivia forty years ago, but Tacna and Arica as well; and she has recently purchased a battle cruiser, three destroyers, an auxiliary vessel, four coast guard cutters, and a quantity of munitions from the British Government, and in any question of control of seaports, these ships are sure to be powerful arguments.

So there is little in the present temper of the three governments concerned to indicate an early solution of the question. Bolivia is not likely to have her outlet to the sea until there is more neighborly goodwill among the west coast republics.

On Hamlet and Hamlets

By ARTHUR SYMONS

I HAVE seen many Hamlets. I have seen romantic, tragic, passionate, morbid, enigmatical, over-subtle and over-exceptional Hamlets, the very bells on the cap of "Fortune's fool." And as almost every actor has acted this part, every one of them gives a different interpretation: that is to say, from the time of Shakespeare to our own age. One knows that Shakespeare, besides other of the dramatists, acted at least one part, which seems to have surprised his audience: the Ghost in "Hamlet." And as Shakespeare put more of his inner self into Hamlet's mouth than into the mouth of any of his other characters, it is not to be forgotten that perhaps the most wonderful prose in our language is spoken by Hamlet in that famous scene with the Players. Take, for instance, this speech: "I have of late—but wherefore I know not—lost all my mirth, foregone all custom of exercise; and indeed it goes so heavily with my disposition that this goodly frame, the earth, seems to me a sterile promontory, that most excellent canopy, the air, look you, this brave over-hanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why, it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapors. What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable: in action how like an angel! in appearance how like a god! The beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet to me, what is this quintessence of dust? Man delights not me: no, nor woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so." If any prose is immortal, this is; and creative also, and imaginative, and lyrical: it has vision, and it has the sense of the immense contrast between "this majestical roof" and "this quintessence of dust" to which we are all reduced at the end.

I have always felt that a play of Shakespeare, seen on the stage, should give one the impression of assisting at "a solemn music." The rhythm of Shakespeare's art is not fundamentally different from that of Beethoven, and "Romeo and Juliet" is a suite, "Hamlet" a symphony. To act either of these plays with whatever qualities of another kind, and to fail in producing this musical rhythm from beginning to end, is to fail in the very foundation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It has been said that Shakespeare will sacrifice his drama to his poetry, and even Hamlet has been quoted against him. But let Hamlet be rightly acted, and whatever has seemed mere meditation will be realized as a part of that thought which makes or waits on action. The outlines of the tragedy are crude, irresistible melodrama, still irresistible to the gallery; and the greatness of the play, though it comes to us by means of its poetry, comes to us legitimately as a growth out of melodrama.

I have often asked myself this question, when I have sat in the stalls watching a play, and having to write about it: is the success of this piece due to the playwright's skill or to the skill of the actors? Nor is any question more difficult to answer than this; which Lamb certainly does his best to answer in one of his underlined sentences, in regard to the actor. *"He must be thinking all the while of his appearance, because he knows that all the while the spectators are judging of it."* And again when he says: "In fact, the things aimed at in theatrical representations are to arrest the spectator's eye upon the form and the gesture, and to give a more favorable hearing to what is spoken: it is not what the character is, but how he looks; not what he says, but how he speaks it." Was anything more fundamentally true ever said on what the actor *ought* to do? Lamb answered it again, in his instinctive fashion of aiming his arrow straight at the mark, when he said of a performance of Shakespeare in which there were two great actors, that "it seemed to embody and realize conceptions which had hitherto assumed no distinct shape," but that "when the novelty is past, we find to our cost that instead of realizing an idea, we have only materialized and brought down a fine vision to the standard of flesh and blood."

Every artist who has the sense of the sublime knows that the pure genius is essentially silent, and that his revelation has in it more of vision than of reality. For when he deigns to appear, he is constrained, under penalty of extinction, to lessen himself so as to pass into the Inaccessible. He creates; if he fails in creation, he is of necessity condemned to the utter darkness. He is the ordinator of chaos: he calls and disposes of the blind elements; and when we are uplifted in our admiration before some sublime work, it is not that he creates an idea in us: it is that, under the divine influence of the man of genius, this idea, which was in us, obscure to itself, is reawakened.

I am confronted now with Villiers de l'Isle Adam in his conjectures in regard to certain questions—never yet settled—in "Hamlet." A modern man of taste might ask what Shakespeare would have answered if the actor who played Hamlet's part were to interrogate the Specter "escaped from hideous Night" as to whether he had seen God's face, whether he wanted to be concerned with, not the eternal mysteries, but with what he had seen in hell and what he hated seeing on earth; and, if he had come only to utter absurdities, really, why need he have died at all?

The Ghost, by the mere fact of being there, seems, at first sight, an absurdity; but if he has really seen God and the Absolute and if he has entered into them—which is impossible—the sublimity of his words might seem to be superfluous; and yet the incoherences that he utters are all the more terrifying because of their incomprehensibility. "The secret of the Absolute cannot be expressed with syntax, and therefore one cannot ask the ghost to produce more than an *impression.*" The Specter, for Shakespeare, is not a human being: he is obsession. Had he wanted Hamlet really to perceive the ghost and had he thought this dramatic effect ought to seize on the imagination of the audience, it was because he was certain that every one of them, in the ghost perceived by Hamlet, would see the familiar ghost that actually haunts himself.

Hamlet's soliloquy "To be or not to be" is a magnificent disavowal—on the part of Shakespeare. And if one excuses the contradiction by supposing that Hamlet tried to deliver himself from the obsession, to doubt, one can only reply that he never doubts the Ghost itself, but the nature of this ghost; for he says at the end of the second act:

> The spirit I have seen
> May be the devil: and the devil hath power
> To assume a pleasing shape; yea, and perhaps,
> Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
> (As he is very potent with such spirits),
> Abuses me to damn me.

Therefore if we compare the motive and the spirit of those sickly phrases with those of the soliloquy, we shall realize that this has *no relation whatsoever* with the superstitious character of Hamlet; even more so, because every single word of them is in fragrant contradiction with the entire drama.

I have no intention of discussing either Mr. Martin Hervey's representation of Hamlet or the somber and sinister Hamlet acted by Josef Keinz in Berlin; or the performance of Tree, or of Forbes-Robertson; or of anyone's, with the exception of that given by Edward Sothern. He is by no means the only Hamlet, for there are always—to quote Browning—"points in Hamlet's soul unseized by the Germans yet." Sothern had depth in his acting; and there was nothing fantastic in his grave, subdued, powerful, and piteous representation, in which no symbol, no figment of a German brain, no metaphysical Faust, loomed before us, but a man more to be pitied and not less to be honored than any man in Elsinore. Yet when one considers what Hamlet actually was—and there is no getting at the depths of his mystery—one finds, for one thing, a man too intensely restless to make up his mind on any question of thought, of conduct, and that he does for the most part the opposite of what he says. The pretense of madness is an almost transparent pretense, and used often for a mere effect of malicious wit, in the confusion of fools, or at the prompting of mere nerves. To me Hamlet seems to be cursed with the veritable genius of inaction. Always he is alone, even when he is in a crowd; he is the most sensitive of all Shakespeare's creations; his nerves are jarred, when knaves would play on him as one plays on an instrument; his blood is feverish, infected with the dark melancholy that haunts him. Does he love Ophelia? I see in him no passion for loving: to him passion is an abstract thing. In any case, irresolution is baneful to him; irresolution that loses so many chances, for which no one forgives himself. This Swinburne denies, supposing that the signal characteristic of Hamlet's inmost nature "is by no means irresolution or hesitation or any form of weakness, but rather the strong conflux of contending forces"; adding, what is certainly true, that the compulsory expedition of Hamlet to England and his hot-headed daring prove to us his almost unscrupulous resolution in time of practical need. Only, when all Hamlet's plans of revenge have been executed, with the one exception of his unnecessary death, before he utters his last immortal words "The rest is silence," the thought of death to him is as if a veil had been withdrawn for an instant, the veil which renders life possible, and, for that instant, he has seen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Importing the White Terror

By EUGENE S. BAGGER

IN these restricted days of near-peace, when our Department of State insists on a close scrutiny of the records and motives of aliens desiring to enter this country, the presence in our midst of Mr. Charles Huszar, late Premier of Hungary, is apt to elicit curiosity. Officially, Hungary is still at war with this country; and as landing permits are granted even to Allied citizens only in what to State Department wisdom appears as "meritorious emergency" the question arises what, in the case of Mr. Huszar, are the distinctive features of personality and purpose which have induced our government to extend to a leader of a technically enemy nation a privilege withheld, among others, from that distinguished Frenchman, M. Jean Longuet or more recently from Mr. Huszar's own countryman, Dr. Oscar Jaszi, the Hungarian scholar and pro-ally statesman.*

This curiosity is all the more justified as Mr. Huszar's appearance coincides with the authentic revelation of unspeakable atrocities perpetrated with the connivance—to put it mildly—of the government of which Mr. Huszar is unofficial ambassador. The publication of the Wedgwood report on the White Terror in Hungary has filled Europe with horror and amazement. In the parliaments of Britain, Italy, Holland, and Sweden; in the press of every European country the present Hungarian regime is denounced as the most brutal tyranny in existence. To combat this tyranny the peoples of Europe, as distinguished from their governments, have united in a novel departure. Since June 20 the first international labor boycott in history has been in force against Hungary. Possibly the State Department is unaware of this. Possibly the State Department would not care even if it knew. But at least the State Department ought to know that the present Hungarian regime is entirely dominated by the pro-Hapsburg pro-Hohenzollern militarist element; that it maintains a live connection with Ludendorff, Lüttwitz, and the former Kapp outfit in Germany; that it plans a new war against America's late allies, Czecho-Slovakia, Serbia, and Rumania. These things are known to every intelligent reader of European newspapers. Mr. Huszar is the emissary of this regime. Who is he, and what does he propose to do in the United States?

Before the war Mr. Charles Huszar was a rather insignificant member of the Hungarian diet, adherent of the Catholic People's Party, a group of extreme jingo clericals much in favor with Vienna court circles. This party was among the enthusiastic supporters of the attack on Serbia and the war policy of the Central Powers in general. Elsewhere in this issue we print a document shedding light on a phase of Mr. Huszar's wartime career. It reveals his share in the massacre of a number of Rumanian non-combatants in the Transylvanian town of Brasov. Journalist by profession, during the Bela Kun regime Mr. Huszar drew from the Communist government the standard salary of newspapermen, 2,000 kronen a month. Suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies, he was arrested and confined for a few weeks, his family continuing to draw his salary. In August, 1919, after the overthrow of communism, he was appointed Minister of Education in the Friedrich cabinet which the Allies, thanks to the intervention of Mr. Hoover, refused to recognize because of its avowed championship of Hapsburg restoration.

In November, 1919, after the Rumanian evacuation of Budapest, Mr. Huszar assumed the premiership in the concentration cabinet formed under the auspices of the Allied representative, Sir George Clerk. Mr. Huszar obtained recognition by the Supreme Council on the strength of certain pledges, the most important of which referred to the inclusion of two representatives of the Social Democrats, and to the holding of free and impartial elections. Presently these pledges were violated. The Socialist members, whose tameness is vouchsafed by the fact of Sir George Clerk's patronage, were literally bullied out of the cabinet. The elections were conducted under a terrorism unparalleled even in Hungarian political history. Leaders of Socialists, trade unionists, even of moderate liberals were bludgeoned, imprisoned, or driven out of the country; the rank and file was terrorized into refraining from the ballot. On the eve of the elections Mr. Huszar's government issued the infamous decree providing for the internment, in the Hajmasker camp at the discretion of the Administration, of all persons suspected of "being out of sympathy with the purposes of the Government." All the while the "unofficial" terror of the officers' detachments raged. Hundreds were murdered or tortured to death for no other reason than being Jews, Socialists, or trade unionists. In the issue of *The Nation* of April 3 a document was published relating to the massacre of 200 prisoners at Kecskemet. Reports of this horror, as well as of others, were submitted to Mr. Huszar, yet no action of any kind was taken beyond the issuance of occasional denials. When, in the middle of February, the Socialist editor Somogyi was murdered at Budapest, even Mr. Huszar's conscience revolted. He threatened his resignation unless the assassins—every newsboy knew their names—were arrested within twenty-four hours. They were not arrested. Mr. Huszar did not resign. He quit office several weeks later and for reasons unconnected with the case. Such, in brief, is Mr. Huszar's record in Hungarian public life. Now a remark or two as to his errand.

Mr. Huszar disclaims any political mission whatsoever. He says he represents the Hungarian Red Cross, here with the sole purpose of arranging for the repatriation of Hungarian prisoners of war in Siberia. As a matter of fact, however, these arrangements were made some time ago. Repatriation is in progress; some of the prisoners have actually arrived at home; others are on the way; about five thousand await embarkation. Ships have been provided through the American Red Cross, which organization has also underwritten the expenses. A drive to raise these ex-

* This case is illuminating. During the war Professor Jaszi was the leader of the anti-German, anti-militarist party in Hungary. His attitude was analogous to that of a Hermann Fernau or Dr. Grehling, except that, unlike the German pacifists, he stayed at home and fought his Government on the spot. For two decades prior to the war he had been the champion, against overwhelming odds, of the rights of oppressed nationalities in the old Hungary. He struggled for the Wilsonian principles before Mr. Wilson ever dreamed of them. He is not a Bolshevik; not even a Socialist, but a bourgeois radical. He was a member of Count Karolyi's Government which, in October, 1918, overthrew the Hapsburg monarchy. When Communism came, Jaszi left Hungary and has lived in Vienna since. Not long ago he applied for admission to the United States, stating literary and scientific study as the purpose of his visit. He was turned down by the Vienna representative of the State Department on the ground that literary and scientific study did not constitute a "meritorious emergency," or words to that effect. Thus Dr. Jaszi, the enemy of the Hapsburgs and friend of the Allies, is excluded. Mr. Huszar, the friend of the Hapsburgs and enemy of the Allies, is admitted. An official explanation might be instructive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

penses by popular subscription is on foot both in Hungary and among Hungarians in the United States.

In Hungary the repatriation campaign is conducted under the auspices of the Minister of War and the so-called "M. O. V. E.," the Hungarian National Defense Union. This is the political organization of the terrorist officers. Besides repatriating prisoners of war, it is engaged in preaching anti-Semitism, organizing pogroms, terrorizing members of the National Assembly, as well as private citizens, conducting a royalist propaganda, and fostering irredentism in Slovakia, Jugoslavia, and Transylvania. Under the latter heading is included, apparently, the hiring of assassins to murder officials of the neighbor states, as shown by an affidavit published in the International Relations Section of *The Nation* of July 10. Among American Hungarians the drive to raise funds for repatriation is in charge of men who are wholly in sympathy with the present Hungarian regime. An effort is being made to organize American Hungarians on the basis of "Christian concentration," the polite name for anti-Semitic jingo rowdyism. Irredentism, the doctrine of restoring the old Hungary by means of a new war, if necessary, is being preached to the Hungarian-American masses. Immediately after his arrival Mr. Huszar was in contact with the leaders of this movement. To date the Hungarian-American fund for repatriation of war prisoners amounts to $92,655. As arrangements of a technical or diplomatic nature concerning the Siberian prisoners have already been completed, it may be assumed that the only possible connection Mr. Huszar could have with this campaign is to handle its financial end.

Now, however praiseworthy the purpose of repatriating the long-suffering Siberian prisoners may be, the Hungarian government should not require the hard-earned dollars of the Hungarian workers of America. It has plenty of money to maintain an army far in excess of the country's needs—an army that can only be and is actually an instrument of terrorism and aggression. The Hungarian government has plenty of money, as revealed in the Vienna press, to buy in Austria huge quantities of arms and ammunition, to appropriate ten million kronen for pro-Hapsburg propaganda in Austria, and for the maintenance of a legion of Austrian monarchist ex-officers in an armed camp at Zalaegerszeg, near the Austrian border, the formal and emphatic protest of the government of the Austrian republic notwithstanding.

What are the guaranties that funds raised among Hungarian-Americans for prisoner repatriation will not be applied to military preparations against America's former allies, or for propaganda aiming at Hapsburg restoration? Surely the person of Mr. Huszar, arch-terrorist and persona grata in Hapsburg circles—his principal literary effort is a volume de luxe entitled "Our Royal House"—offers no guaranties. There is, moreover, evidence to the contrary. Some time ago a Dutch committee transmitted money for relief to the Hungarian government. Later a member of Mr. Huszar's own cabinet, Mr. Julius Rubinek, Minister of Agriculture, was compelled to admit that these funds had been diverted to electioneering purposes.

To sum up: Mr. Charles Huszar has been the head of the White Terror Government of Hungary. He is one of the principal advocates of the restoration of the Hapsburg king. His activities here cannot but stimulate racial and religious hatreds and prejudices among Americans of Hungarian origin, and to stir up feuds between them and their neighbors of Slav and Rumanian extraction. Certainly if there is any justification of the present, and let it be hoped, temporary, scrutiny and exclusion on political grounds, of foreign visitors, the intelligence and good faith of the authority which has freely let Mr. Huszar into the country may well be questioned. From the standpoint of democracy his presence is thoroughly objectionable. Or can it be that the Government of the United States will actually countenance the raising of American dollars to restore Hapsburg autocracy for the ending of which our young men died?

In the Driftway

NOW while the Premiers fumble the sick body of Europe and in America the candidates mumble toothlessly over the dead bones of ancient issues, The Drifter, in the midst of so much public unwisdom and corruption, likes to turn to certain instances, sticking here and there in his memory, of fine braveries and heroic kindnesses done by plain men and women. There was that black slave in Kentucky who desired freedom enough—when his master had finally lost all right to his slave's respect, and only then—to run away with his scared, unwilling wife, a larger child or two, and two little ones whom he *carried on his back* across the whole of Ohio into Canada. They had to travel all the way by night, clinging to the most deserted roads, hiding by day in the woods, slinking to freedom. That black father, besides carrying his babies, had the even harder task of keeping up his wife's courage and of quieting the children when the family was in danger, as it repeatedly was, of being discovered; he had to find food for them, and shelter from the weather, and the path across a State almost as blindly as a mole working in the darkness. The whole race of man takes dignity from such an achievement. And there was the young wife whose husband died suddenly on Christmas Eve. While others might have been plunged into a paralysis of grief, and naturally, she thought first of the ardent plans which her husband and her tiny daughter had made for Christmas; and half that night she worked away at carrying them out. With the help of one of her husband's friends she set up a tree and decorated it with the jolly tinsel of the season. She arranged the family stockings as the child had expected them to be arranged, even to those of the father who lay dead under that same roof. Then the next morning, before the daughter knew she was an orphan, she had tasted the delights of the first Christmas she had ever been old enough to appreciate or particularly notice. The Drifter feels there are not half enough medals for heroism to go around. Heroism, perhaps, is all the more heroic for that.

THE DRIFTER

Contributors to This Issue

EUGENE S. BAGGER is a New York journalist who has specialized in Hungarian and Central European politics.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, former member of Parliament, author, leader of the Independent Labor Party, while perhaps the foremost figure in the Scarborough Conference, modestly omits all reference to his prominent participation therein.

"LATINUS" is the pseudonym of an Hispanic-American publicist residing in New York.

ARTHUR SYMONS is the well-known British writer.

"X. Y. Z." is an eminent American army officer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Conquest of Haiti

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 7, 1920, inclosing an article regarding the conduct of marines in Haiti, and also a copy of letter in regard thereto addressed to the Assistant Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The work of the Marine Corps in Haiti started with the occupation in 1915 when it became necessary to land sailors and marines at Port au Prince for the protection of American lives. At that time revolution and anarchy reigned throughout Haiti. The President had been killed and many other murders and atrocities had been committed in the city of Port au Prince as well as in other parts of Haiti. The country was overrun with bandits and murderers, and unscrupulous politicians of the worst kind were assisting in the disorders. A new president was elected by the assembly and American forces were kept in Port au Prince for the preservation of order and the protection of Americans and other foreigners. It became necessary to establish marine guards at all the sea ports for the protection of lives and property, all at the request of the Haitian Government. Since the occupation and the signing of the treaty with Haiti it has been the endeavor of the Marine Corps to carry out its instructions in Haiti in as efficient a manner as possible, every consideration and thought being given to the welfare of the Haitians and the advancement of the country.

At times strong measures were necessary for self-protection and for the protection of honest and peaceful inhabitants. Orders regarding proper sanitation were issued, roads were improved, and other work was carried on for the general welfare of the Haitians. As the Haitian army was abolished it was necessary that a force be established to replace the army. The Haitian Gendarmerie, consisting of natives and officered by marines was organized in 1916, and has increased in size and efficiency under the supervision of the occupation. It has been necessary for the marines to assist the Gendarmerie at times when revolutions broke out. As in all work in countries like Haiti mistakes are bound to be made, and policies, orders, and instructions are sometimes not carried out properly. As regards the Marine Corps, some officers and men have failed, at times necessitating courts-martial and other punishments, but it has been and is the duty and aim of the Marine Corps authorities here and in Haiti to work solely for the interests and advancement of Haiti and the Haitian people, and progress has been and is being made in Haiti today.

Washington, July 12 JOHN A. LEJEUNE
Major General Commandant
U. S. Marine Corps

[Major-General Lejeune's reply is substantially an admission of the truth of the charges against the American occupation in Haiti contained in The Conquest of Haiti by Mr. Herbert J. Seligmann, published in *The Nation* of July 10. General Lejeune prefaces his remark that "strong measures" were necessary with a picture of the "anarchy" that reigned in Haiti. The fact is that American lives had been safe for years and were safe at the time of intervention. At no time before the American intervention was there the anarchy that prevailed afterward when the United States Marines were murdering, torturing, and robbing peaceable Haitians and provoking them to armed rebellion. To admit that "in countries like Haiti mistakes are bound to be made" is to dismiss, in a phrase, cruelties, stupidities, violations of humanity and decency which, had they occurred in Armenia, Siberia, Ireland, India, or Belgium, would have elicited storms of protest from United States citizens. As for the "duty and aim" of United States Marines in Haiti, that is a secret which the Department of State has not yet seen fit to divulge to the American public.—EDITOR.]

Why Be a Farmer?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: We wondered, with our little boy who called our attention to it, why you published the advertisement of Swift and Company in your June issue. Somehow I believe you did it in order to hear from the farmers, and for our part we would like to know where the money goes if not to the middleman.

In December, 1919, we sold fat hogs at 12 cents a pound and fat beef at 7 cents. Some farmers got as low as 9 cents for hogs. My relatives whom I visited in Indianapolis at Christmas time were paying 50 cents for beef and 60 for pork. Since then we have slaughtered our hogs ourselves for our own use, and we know that the work of slaughtering and curing the meat is nothing compared to that of raising hogs—and must be infinitely easier in big modern abattoirs. We must carry buckets of slop several times a day, buy ground feed at high prices, and plow, plant, cultivate, cut, and shuck the corn—a big summer's work, it is too—that we need.

One farm boy we know bought a carload of corn at $1.50 a bushel last fall and fattened some hogs to sell this spring when he thought the price would be good, but he lost money. No wonder we cannot keep boys on the farm. The only reason we older folks stay is because we *have* to. The farmers are too tired, ignorant, and impoverished to organize to set prices, but I am hoping La Follette's plan of organizing them may be carried out. His magazine, *The Nation*, and the Socialist papers we read have sympathy for the poor, and the farmers are certainly among these. There is absolutely nothing to induce a boy to stay on the farm.

Moores Hill, Indiana, June 23 (MRS.) F. L. HOUSTON

Suppressing Polish Atrocities

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You probably know that some time ago the British Government sent a delegation headed by Sir Stuart M. Samuel to investigate the persecution of Jews in Poland. After endless delays which caused debates and inquiries in Parliament the report was made public by the government on July 5, 1920.

It was not a pleasant report. The commission placed the entire guilt of the pogroms on the government. It gave the number of killed and wounded and brought details of the brutality employed by the Polish soldiers in punishing the Jewish population. It proved conclusively that the pogroms were organized by the military forces and that the government neither punished the offenders nor made any monetary retribution for the great damages that were done. The findings of the commission were corroborated and strengthened by the reports of Captain Wright and Sir Horace Rumbold. These reports were incorporated with the reports of Sir Stuart M. Samuel in the "White Book" of the British Government.

The Jewish Correspondence Bureau sent a cable giving a concise resume of these reports to all the Jewish newspapers in the land. The report appeared in full with editorial comment in all the Yiddish dailies. And here comes the puzzling part of the affair. For a week not a word about this report appeared in the English language newspapers either in New York or the other cities! How do you explain this? Can it be that the Associated Press, the United Press, and the other organs of information had missed this report? Or did they, on account of the nature and character of the report, deliberately chose to close their eyes and ears and pass it by in silence? A representative of the American Jewish Congress finally supplied material to two papers which printed some of it; a third, the New York *Times*, printed a belated cable mentioning the Samuel report, but printing, instead of the report, an attempted rebuttal of it.

New York, July 13 GEORGE KESSNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Deported

By ANZIA YEZIERSKA

I am the deported.

The ship on which I stand is leaving the harbor.

The foaming waves converging at the throbbing stern of the boat are pushing me irrevocably away.

This America whose mountains I dashed myself against as against insensate stone,

These rock barriers on which I beat out the anguish of my protest and rebellion,

This country on which I vented the rage of my frustrated ideals,

The hard commercialism that I cursed and denounced—where is it now?

Behold! The mountains are springing into life, the barriers of prejudice and hate are dissolving in the mist.

These very waves that are separating me, somehow seem to link me with the land I am leaving.

Through the transfigured distance, I see the spires of great buildings, temples of achievement, landmarks of men who built and created while I tore down and destroyed.

Oh God! Why do I just begin to see America, now that I am torn away?

In my adolescent blindness, I thought that America was a quick leap into Utopia.

I thought that America was a ripe fruit that I could pluck from the visionary garden of liberty.

Instead of nurturing this garden that would some day bring forth the fruit I longed for, instead of propping up the boughs of the young trees, clearing out the weeds, I lopped off the branches, tore at the roots, trampled on tender buds.

Now, when it is too late, now I see what America is—and what I might have made of America.

Now, I see that America was a dream to be realized, a potential love to be fathomed, a child to be warmed and nurtured, a personality to be created, an unchartered world to be explored.

Oh America! The barb of my anguish is that in losing you for myself I lost the chance of helping to make you for all Americans.

Beloved land of my dreams! My body is torn away, but am I really losing you?

No—I can never lose you—knowing how I loved you.

My ceaseless longings have made you part of the throb and pulse of my innermost being.

All my hates were but the blind gropings of my love.

I see now that I have loved you even when I hurt you, even when I stormed and raged and trampled on you!

Oh America! Though now I am cast away—branded—exiled,

It was worth all I suffered finding you.

All my life have I waited for this flash of light—this glimpse of understanding—this clairvoyance of the spirit.

All my life have I struggled to know that which I now know:

America is not here or there, America is everywhere man in his helplessness reaches out to God.

America is everywhere man in his loneliness builds up the vision of love.

I, the deported, go forth linked forever to America by my exile from America.

I go forth to spread among the people of the earth the faith in the better world to come—the deathless dream—America!

The Feasters

By RIDGELY TORRENCE

I.

At Makah Indian Reservation.

From the waters of the east
Came a people bleak and eager,
Sailor, priest and stern beleaguer,
Sailing meager to the feast
From the waters of the east.

Leave the hunger to the least—
And their hosts were least among them.
So the bitter crust they flung them
And they sung them when they ceased,
"Leave the hunger to the least."

To the waters of the west
Go a people few and lonely,
Having now their hunger only,
Going lonely on their quest
To the waters of the west.

Watch them only, it is best;
Braves and lovers, gods and daughters
Dumbly to the west sea waters
Go and let the ancient breast
Find the banquet and the guest.

II.

At the Rio Grande.

Toward the river in the south
Feasting fingers reach to battle,
Glide and rattle in the drouth
Toward the fats that follow battle;
Oils and ores and desert cattle;
Sweet to feed a feasting mouth,
Past the river in the south.

So the children of the sun,
With the feasters' fingers near them,
At the stream, have learned to fear them
When they hear them reach and run
Toward the morsels one by one,
Toward the ores and oils that smear them,
Toward the gardens of the sun.

When their doom is not far off
Then the feasters' faiths grow hollow.
When their leaders turn and follow
From their wallow by the trough,
When they march, through raving hours,
Breeding war to bear them dreams,
When the nightmare foals, with screams,
Rolling on the bloody flowers,
When a death shall save a trough
Then the doom is not far off.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

My Second Country

My Second Country. By Robert Dell. John Lane Company.

MR. DELL, who has lived twelve years in France, writes of the French people with sympathy and affection, but does not allow those feelings to color his judgment or subdue his criticism; since his object is, by examining into certain defects of French methods and institutions, to push the recovery of the land he has chosen as his home. In his opinion it is Voltaire's influence to which France returns after every reaction; "the French in the majority remain at bottom skeptical, rationalist, and intellectualist." He warns against the common tendency of travelers to accept Paris as typical of the rest of France and to forget that the provinces are as varied as the races which make them up. Though Paris has long dominated France politically and intellectually, and continues to govern it politically by reason of an extremely centralized administration, intellectually there is already a movement toward decentralization—essential, he shows, to any measure of democracy or internationalism.

The key-note of Mr. Dell's book is his conviction that the present regime is nearing its close. "By timely reforms the parliamentary system might have been saved, but the bourgeoisie, which has ruled France during the nineteenth century, has been as blind and conservative as was the noblesse in the eighteenth century, and is likely to pay the same penalty." Through the maze of paradoxes which French character presents, definite pictures emerge of the outstanding types. In these definitions lie the clues on the one hand to the spirit which has governed France so fatally as regards her own interests, the reckless greed of a money-lending bourgeoisie which has allowed the high priests of finance to pull too many wires, and on the other hand to the blind indomitable spirit of devotion to La Patrie which has sustained the French soldiery throughout the war and has proved the French people anything but the decadent race they were supposed to be. The reactionary power of the French Government becomes more comprehensible when we are brought to realize that Republican France has a Royalist constitution and a Bonapartist administration. "A dictator or a bureaucracy armed with such an instrument as the French administrative system," says Mr. Dell, "can secure the absolute mastery of the country and reduce opposition to impotence unless and until it becomes revolt." Little interest is taken in foreign affairs, which as a rule are left entirely to the Foreign Minister. Among other powers, the President has that of making treaties such as the Franco-Russian Alliance, countersigned only by one Minister, and of withholding knowledge of them from both Cabinet and Parliament for as long as he deems fit. Thus "two men have the power to commit the French people without their knowledge or consent to obligations which may involve the risk of their lives and property and the gravest danger to the country." When to this are added such evils as the medieval structure of the judicial and criminal procedures, and the fact that the Senate can indefinitely obstruct measures passed by the Chamber, it is small wonder that the French parliamentary system has become discredited.

France is far behind England and Germany in social and industrial legislation, and it is indeed well that attention has at last been drawn in print to the shocking sanitary conditions prevalent throughout the country, with their effects on typhoid and tuberculosis. Mr. Dell attributes the lack of progressive legislation in part to the general ignorance of economics among Frenchmen of all classes and parties, even Socialists. There is no organized movement, for instance, in favor of free trade, though the protectionist policy has rendered French colonial administration unprofitable, stifled French trade, and bids fair to postpone indefinitely the restoration of the devastated areas. French national finance is represented as being in so desperate a state of chaos as to present no solution save repudiation of the National Debt, which means revolution. Mr. Dell insists that France is naturally an agricultural rather than an industrial country, and that her hope for the future lies in development along agricultural lines. The methods of cultivation, however, are far behind the times, and the pettifogging system of land ownership—each peasant proprietor growing just what he wants for himself—renders improved machinery or production on a large scale difficult to arrive at. The terrible loss of life in the war is another deterrent factor. "Unless," says Mr. Dell, "there is an immediate and radical change in French agricultural methods, a large quantity of land will inevitably go out of cultivation"—whereas, if such change could be effected, greater production would result from half the labor. Meanwhile, time only adds emphasis to his complaint that the French Government, instead of concentrating on fundamental needs of reconstruction, concerns itself primarily with boundary disputes and territorial acquisitions.

"Without a knowledge of the proletariat one cannot know the true France," says Mr. Dell. His experience has certainly been wide and he has friends in all walks of French life. He tells of the recent tendency of the salaried bourgeoisie, including actors and bank clerks, to form trade unions and throw in their lot with the proletariat; but he admits that the unions in general are far weaker than in England or America. Syndicalism, Etatisme, and State Monopolies are discussed at length in pages from which it is possible to gather a definite notion of all the French parties. What is badly needed at present is a general clarification of terms in such matters, so that the various factional labels may come to have approximately similar meanings in all countries. The war seems to have brought the French Socialist and Syndicalist movements together, each adopting something of the other's theories. "In the new synthesis between Socialism and Syndicalism," says Mr. Dell, "the economic function of the state, or rather of the administration, will be what the Manchester Liberals said that it should be—to protect the interests of the consumer. The state as an organ of administration will replace the state as an organ of authority; the administration of things will replace the government of men. Some means will be found of conciliating the interests of the community as a whole with those of each group of producers." This is beyond doubt a model program, though the means remain to be worked out, and leaders of the quality of Jaurès remain to be found. But Mr. Dell is confident that "when the moment comes, the men also will be forthcoming." B. U. BURKE

Philosophers Abroad

Letters from China and Japan. By John Dewey and Alice Chipman Dewey. E. P. Dutton and Company.

PROFESSOR and Mrs. Dewey have discovered that most of the things they always knew about China and Japan are fascinatingly true. Their letters were written to their children here with no view to publication and edited by their daughter Evelyn Dewey. It is not difficult to guess the authorship of most of the letters, and Mrs. Dewey's interest in the more pictorial aspects of the countries, in the women, and in their educational and domestic problems, admirably supplements Professor Dewey's more historical and speculative observations. From the time they landed in Japan they found themselves impressed by the fine surfaces of a country in which no discourteous words were ever heard and no bad manners exhibited. In all the habits of the people they felt the essential antiquity of the Japanese. "Any country is old where birth and death are like the coming and dropping of leaves on a tree, and where the individual is of as much importance as the leaf." After overcoming the "fear of the pain of being drawn by a fellow-being" they traveled with great comfort in 'rickshas and automobiles and Professor Dewey was given a pass on the Japanese

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

railways. Mrs. Dewey, alas, must pay, as the Minister of the Interior explained with great sorrow that such a privilege could not be extended to a woman. Japanese food soon came to be attractive, and the travelers got to the point where raw fish and raw chicken wrapped in seaweed had no terrors. Mrs. Dewey could boast the ability to sit on her heels for the length of a Japanese meal, but Professor Dewey ignominiously sat as he was accustomed. The amount of tea to be drunk at all the luncheons, festivals, teas, and dinners to which they were invited at first completely submerged them, but before long they could write with pardonable pride that they had drunk tea six times within three hours in addition to eating a meal the consumption of which had occupied most of that time. Their friends and acquaintances throughout Japan were the "representative intellectual liberals," not the "official crowd," so that Professor Dewey felt after six weeks that he had "seen less but found out more than I ever expected about Japanese conditions, which is quite the opposite of European experience in traveling." They lived in Japanese homes, attended the Japanese "movies" and theater, where they saw Ganjiro, the greatest actor of Japan, on the stage in every scene for eight hours, encountered courtesy even in shopping expeditions, lectured with interpreters to audiences of teachers from which women were conspicuously absent, visited the Women's University and numbers of schools, attended tea ceremonies, the festival of dolls, a wedding, a funeral, saw the Emperor, were entertained by geisha dancing, when a woman (Mrs. Dewey) appeared "for the first time in history at a man's carouse in Japan," visited the temples, and saw the famous cherry blossoms.

After three months in Japan they went on to China, expecting to spend but a few weeks there. Almost as soon as they landed in Shanghai they began to realize that everything in Japan "is a little overmade, there seems to be a rule for everything, and admiring their artistic effects one also sees how near art and the artificial are together." It is quite evident from the tone of the Chinese letters that Professor Dewey found in China meat for a pragmatist and a democrat that Japan had failed to provide. There is comparatively little account of the more superficial aspects of the Chinese experience such as filled the letters from Japan. Mrs. Dewey occasionally reminds her children that they are being fed, frequently and well, and describes for them the domestic arrangements and social limitations of the small-footed Chinese lady. But both she and Professor Dewey found themselves plunged from the very beginning into the turmoil of the Chinese political situation. At first they felt that one must begin at the end to read the Chinese book, and they found themselves almost completely baffled by the Chinese acceptance of things as they are. After a month whose revelations complicated the problem for him and at the same time increased his interest in it, Professor Dewey wrote: "Status quo is China's middle name, mostly status and a little quo." And again: "It is very easy to see how cultivated people take refuge in art and spirituality when politics are corrupt and the general state of social life is discouraging; you see it here, and how in the end it increases the decadence." The Chinese helplessness before the "single-track mind" of the Japanese appealed to the travelers more and more strongly. The student strikes, the Japanese boycott, the refusal of the Chinese delegates at the Peace Conference to sign the treaty—all seemed hopeful signs, though at first the visitors were a little afraid that a Chinese clerk in a tailor shop might be right when he told them: "Chinaman he got weak mind; pretty soon he forget." But the unexpected success of the student strikes and their far-reaching effect won Professor Dewey's complete admiration. "To think of kids, in our country, from fourteen on, taking the lead in starting a big clean-up reform political movement and shaming merchants and professional men into joining them." There was hope in such a movement, and the philosophers added a year to their intended brief stay that they might take some part in its fruition.

IRITA VAN DOREN

Science and Peace

Science and War. The Rede Lecture for 1919. By Lord Moulton. Cambridge University Press.

Wealth from Waste; Elimination of Waste a World Problem. By Henry J. Spooner. London: George Routledge and Sons.

The Place of Agriculture in Reconstruction; a Study of National Programs of Land Settlement. By James B. Morman. E. P. Dutton and Company.

The World's Food Resources. By J. Russell Smith. Henry Holt and Company.

The Strategy of Minerals; a Study of the Mineral Factor in the World Position of America in War and Peace. Edited by George Otis Smith, Director U. S. Geological Survey. D. Appleton and Company.

The Outlook for Research and Invention. By Nevil Monroe Hopkins. D. Van Nostrand Company.

IN the Rede Lecture at Cambridge University last year Lord Moulton gave a graphic summary of the great problems solved during the war through scientific investigations, and showed the dependence of our society upon the continuous solution of such problems, in peace as well as in war. The role played in battle by new types of explosives, by the internal combustion engine, by the storage battery, and by the wireless occupies the bulk of the booklet; while there are briefer references to the gyroscope, to photography, to chemical warfare defense, to sound-ranging, and to hygiene. As an Englishman Lord Moulton is proud of the achievements of the Allies; but as a scientist he sees vastly more in science than the special knowledge needed to fight Germans. He insists that the power which science gives to mankind must be used henceforth to promote the universal welfare. The glory of science after all does not lie in what it can do to make war a more intense and more efficient hell.

Mr. Spooner's book bears all the ear-marks of the war psychology. His world still consists of separate nations which must through all eternity be in conflict with one another for power and wealth and competitive advantages. It will always be necessary to appeal for thrift in terms of hatred, and to point the moral of high efficiency in terms of damage to be inflicted upon "enemies." The book is nevertheless a valuable collection of concrete materials showing where actual savings are possible in household and industrial management. Significant, too, are the sections on the waste which is owing to the neglect of organic factors in industry such as health, safety, and nutrition. The commercial wastes involved in adulteration, misused fuels, neglected agricultural opportunities, and the failure to reclaim waste lands or reforest denuded areas are criticized soundly and constructively, if sometimes monotonously. A hundred pages of the book contain interesting examples of savings brought about through the utilization of materials previously considered useless by-products of industrial, agricultural, and domestic processes; and there are many suggestions as to lines along which further development may be expected. The time of setting hens and growing children can be put to better use, he says; the children of England he admits to be both adorable and infinitely capable.

Mr. Morman, who was Assistant Secretary of the Federal Farm Loan Board, has brought together in convenient form a body of valuable information on the plans that have been developed for returning demobilized soldiers to the land in Canada, France, and Great Britain. In addition he points out clearly enough the important problems connected with the maintenance of agricultural production and the difficulties of keeping up a trained agricultural population. He does not blame the magazines and the movies for drawing young people to the cities; he believes that rural life should and could be made both attractive and profitable. He seems especially well informed on the matter of rural credits, and on the difficulties in the way of a satisfactory solution. But Mr. Morman's economics is of the kind manufactured for home consumption before the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In discussing the general problem of the return from a war to a peace basis, he seems to think of the "employment" of men and women in productive labor as an expense to the country analogous to the expense of carrying on campaigns. While the production of food and clothing and habitations is necessary to the welfare of the nation, it is necessary, he implies, because it enables people to carry on business, earn wages, and make profits, not because it enables them to satisfy fundamental organic and spiritual hungers. For him the great problem is not to supply people with homes and food and clothing through the organization of our ingenuity and skill and effort; the great problem is to return to business as was usual before the great interruption.

A very satisfactory compendium of significant information is Professor Smith's study of the world's food supply. It is of course largely statistical, but the statistics are presented in a live and interesting manner, and they are so surrounded with descriptive and illuminating discussion that the quantitative aspects of the problems treated can be at least tolerated by the reader who has "no head for figures" whatever. The argument runs in effect that wheat and rice and other cereals, potatoes and pork, milk and fish, and various fruits, sugar and legumes, have a definite place in maintaining the human race in a condition essential for civilized living; that these various materials are necessary in such and such amounts; that the conditions for their production are favorable within certain specified areas, and call for the application of labor and intelligence. Here, in short, is the problem of keeping the race alive without making any part of it believe that its welfare depends upon exploiting some other part. Now the lines along which per capita production may be increased without a proportionate increase of per capita labor constitute the foundations of peace and progress. These lines are indicated in the various chapters with a most fascinating elaboration of detail, involving tractors and threshing machines here, the improvement of varieties through scientific breeding there, the scientific feeding of stock, the drying of milk and other foods for preservation, the possibilities of fish resources, the destruction of insect pests, and the overcoming of food prejudices. The application of science to the solution of these fundamental problems makes possible the economic autonomy of such countries as the United States, with relatively large areas and large variety of natural resources; but it makes increasingly undesirable such economic autonomy on the part of any country, since this is to be had only at the cost of increasing discomfort and waste of resources. "The contrast between Japan and Georgia, between one and one-fourth and twenty or more acres per family, is the stuff of which wars are made." The lust for land together with the lust for power are the great enemies of human peace and progress; they can be met together by establishing conditions of trade that enable every country to profit from the specialized resources and efficiency of every other country—not by attempting to secure for each country complete economic independence or dominance over others. Mr. Smith's book contains over six hundred pages of sound sociology and statesmanship based on exact knowledge.

The conflict between the feeling that makes men strive for the "economic independence" of a nation and the knowledge which makes the same men see that such "independence" is an impossible abstraction is well illustrated in the compilation of useful information called "The Strategy of Minerals." The several chapters on the importance and distribution of essential minerals—fuels, iron and coal, copper, lead and zinc, the minor metals, minerals required in chemical and other industries—are by experts of the United States Geological Survey, of which the editor is the director. There is an introduction by ex-Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, who expresses the conviction that there will be no end to wars or threats of war "until the nations of the world regard themselves more really the trustees of their resources . . . for the world at large." In A Look Ahead, Mr. Smith says that the kind of industrial organization now needed is one gauged for enduring peace and involving a world-wide interchange of essentials on a democratic basis, avoiding imperialism and dominance; "industrial independence is the goal toward which a nation should face, but not a goal which it should have either the intention or the desire to attain." The folly and waste of industrial independence are recognized by Mr. Smith and by Mr. Lane; most of the other contributors, however, seem to assume that the United States must either make itself completely independent of other nations or must make other nations so dependent upon its resources that its power will remain permanently secure. These engineers know their business, and they tell their technical stories in an interesting way; but it would seem that other specialists could better take over the study of international relations. An appendix prints the Food and Fuel Control Act of August, 1917, a great deal of historical material on the administration of mineral resources during the war, and a number of good diagrams on mineral supplies, production, and reserves.

Mr. Hopkins's book will be of special interest to young men and women who are interested in research and invention as careers, particularly if they happen to be without the advantages of higher technical education. There is a warm enthusiasm here both for the game and for the service, there is an appreciation of some of the great contributors to scientific and technical progress, and there is an abundance of suggestion as to the kinds of problems that inventive ability can profitably tackle.

Every one of the twenty-odd scientists represented in these half-dozen books seems to have a clear understanding of the complexity of modern life, at least so far as it touches his specialty; every one realizes the far-reaching interdependence of all parts of the world; and every one has learned that in science at least there is constant change. Nevertheless, most of these men seem obsessed with an almost childish provincialism in their attitudes toward "foreign" lands and peoples, with a dread of conceiving any system of human relations substantially different from the one that prevailed while they were children, with a simple hope in the ultimate preeminence of their own nations not as leaders in science or service but as masters of other peoples' destinies. Each pays tribute to the lofty sentiments pronounced by Woodrow Wilson in his several messages to the people of the world between Lusitania and Armistice; yet with a few exceptions each conceives Democracy to be an arrangement whereby the shrewdest and strongest can with certainty come into their own—the mastery of others. Science is without doubt essential to the very existence of the sort of thing we call civilization; but it is evident that the rising generation must give its scientists a training somewhat different from that which our own generation received.

BENJAMIN C. GRUENBERG

Faith and War

Twentieth Century French Writers. By Madame Mary Duclaux. Charles Scribner's Sons.

THIS volume was in the printer's hands in August, 1914. For its publication today Madame Duclaux has added a post-war preface and interpolated a passage here and there. But substantially it is now what it was then, and therein lies its extraordinary value. The war turned everything into legend and made of every face an angel's or an ogre's mask. Now that the world is mildly and tentatively beginning to use its mind again, a book like this serves to mend the broken continuity of truth and to restore the normal temper of one's studies.

No one who was in intelligent contact with the literature of France in the opening years of the twentieth century was unfamiliar with the movement which Madame Duclaux—the friend and biographer of Ernest Renan and once the wife of James Darmstetter—viewed and recorded with a reluctant and be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wildered sympathy. The movement arose, long before, when Ferdinand Brunetière announced the bankruptcy of science and Paul Bourget led the Neo-Catholic reaction in literature. The outside world discovered Anatole France in his old age and misinterpreted the spectacular success of Bergson's lectures at the Sorbonne. But a few here and there were conscious of the fact that the soul of twentieth-century France was rather to be sought in the conversion of Maurice Barrès to the doctrine of "national energy," and that to the country's youth Jean Christophe was already "a man of yesterday." It was this spiritual scene which Madame Duclaux beheld with a wistful eye. "Truth? Humanity? The old-fashioned words are rarely heard. We hear of Authority, of Order, of the claims of one's race, of the rights and responsibilities of the strong. This new generation, which has witnessed no war, has the mind and disposition of conquerors."

Even in its mysticism, however, and in its new dedication to the doctrine of "Force and Faith," the mind of France preserved its ancient order and harmony of method. Fifty years of positivism and skepticism had left it weary and ill at ease. "Pour atténuer certaines peines morales," Barrès felt the need of "merging himself into something larger and more durable than any individual existence." He found that something larger and more durable in an intense and militant nationalism. Younger men united with the same nationalism a return to the doctrines of their ancestral Church, and thus arose the generation described by Madame Duclaux: "Fresh and frank and admirably valiant, full of prompt physical courage and intellectual docility." "Intellectual docility"—those words express the core of the situation. To submerge the reason and to engage, at the dictates of patriotism and religion, in expansive activities—is not that, in every country, the instinctive refuge of men from "certaines peines morales"? Only in France it became a conscious doctrine; it was inscribed on the banners of all the younger intellectuals; it attained its highest symbolical embodiment when Ernest Psichari, the grandson of Renan, enlisted before the war in the Colonial Artillery, entered the Catholic communion, and declared: "La force est toujours du côté du droit."

Might is right! These words which have made so many good people shudder were of the essence of the spiritual attitude with which the young artists and writers of France, the followers of Paul Claudel, the admirers of Charles Péguy, went into the Great War. And why not? If you have persuaded yourself, with Claudel, to believe in "an absolute Existence—where right is always right and where wrong is always wrong, to all eternity," what chance have you, being human, of not identifying your particular brand of right with that eternal rightness? If, in addition, you are by impulse and philosophy a militant patriot, are you not bound to believe that your divisions and tanks and dreadnaughts will, because they are on the side of the eternal right, have might against the powers of darkness? Thus he who has the might proves thereby that he was right. For can might, in a mystic and moral universe, fail to be on the side of right? You must not, of course, remember any more than you must think. How would that doctrine have worked in 1870? But the point of this sort of philosophy in every country is a voluntary abstention from memory and reflection.

The gifted poet Charles Péguy, who fell in the first battle of the Marne and became the idol of France during the war, represents this whole attitude in his single person and career. He had a "withering contempt for science and scientists." It is not they who will help us, he cried,

> Mais la Foi qui nous sauve et seule nous discerne
> Saura nous retrouver dans la fange et l'ordure.

He came to reject all that is political, temporal, personal, for the mystical, spiritual, general. He repudiated the socialism of his youth and approached the "military and aristocratic theory of a state." He ended with an apotheosis of militarism: "Il n'y a rien à faire à cela, et il n'y à rien à dire. Le soldat mesure la quantité de terre où on parle une langue, où règnent des mœurs, un esprit, une âme, un culte, une race. Le soldat mesure la quantité de terre où une âme peut respirer. Le soldat mesure la quantité de terre où un peuple ne meurt pas." And that, too, is logical enough, if only you have faith, faith in your own eternal rightness and hence in your inherent superiority, faith, therefore, in the violent and, if necessary, bloody affirmation of your culture and your race. Faith may not always move mountains; it does move armies and annex colonies and silence scruples. Not until you have faith enough can you see your enemy as a "beast of prey" and yourself as the warrior of God.

Once only does Madame Duclaux betray a sense of the terrible irony of the situation. The war swept from her mind the doubts and hesitations which it harbored in 1914. In her post-war preface she recants—as so many have done—her whole intellectual past and flings at Romain Rolland the reproach of "high-minded crankiness." Her study of Barbusse is brief and distant. She, too, needed to assuage her "peines morales"; she, too, merged herself into something larger by embracing the faith of all the nationalists at war. It is the only way of making war endurable. The reason and the heart must be silenced before hate and cruelty can become sufficiently effective. War must have faith. Only humility and doubt and the facing of our "peines morales" can save what is left of civilization.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

The Strategy of the Great War

The Strategy of the Great War. By William L. McPherson. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

BECAUSE this book relates to military policy, it is equally interesting to the trained soldier and to the intelligent civilian. To the general reader the most interesting side of the art and science of war is grand strategy; strategy in general being nothing but an exercise of trained common sense, and its principles being unchanging and universal.

Germany lost the war because she sought sea power. Mr. McPherson makes that very plain in his best chapter, Sea Power in the War, where indeed he might also have pointed out how Russia lost her war with Japan because she chose, before the war began, to attempt the defense of the eastern flank of her empire with sea power. Russia took over Port Arthur as a base for that sea power and sent half her navy there to invite destruction before the other half could arrive, similarly to be destroyed. And while she was spending money on battleships destined to provoke a disgraceful war and to be worse than useless in that war, she could not find the money to double-track a Trans-Siberian Railway which would have made her strategically safe from Japan's attack while constituting at the same time a proper tool for the peaceful development of Siberia. If Russia never had possessed a warship she probably would have been spared a disastrous defeat and many billions of peace-time expenditure. Precisely the same thing may be said of Germany.

Mr. McPherson was an "Eastern Fronter." He believes, and he argues with great force, that either side might have won before the autumn of 1918 if it had remained upon the defensive in France and Belgium and devoted itself to operations in the East. Germany, for example, he thinks might thus have put Russia out of the war long before the spring of 1917, in time, in fact, to keep Rumania neutral. He believes that the Germans engaged in the Verdun offensive in 1916 might have sufficed for such a task, and, of course, no one can be sure that he is not right. With Russia out and Rumania neutral, and with the United States not yet dragged in through submarine operations, the Central Powers might very well have won the war a year

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or two before they definitely lost it. He is convinced, too, that the Gallipoli operation should have been persisted in by the Allies at all hazards, and presents fairly good evidence that the fleet might have taken the straits if it had made one more determined effort. At any rate he is sure, and not without excellent reason, that Allied troops from the vicinity of Salonica could have taken Constantinople at a little later period. And if the entrance to the Black Sea, or the Black Sea itself, had fallen to the Allies before Germany could place Russia hors-de-combat, such assistance might have been extended to Russia as would have preserved her effectiveness and retained her most valuable alliance; which again might have ended the war before 1918—under these circumstances, in favor of the Allies.

Accepting Mr. McPherson's view that either side might have won if it had devoted its offensive energies to the Eastern front, it is interesting to speculate upon what would have happened if not one but both sides had restricted their offensive operations to that front. Doubtless then the element of time would have become the determining factor, the question being whether the sea route to Odessa could be commanded by the Entente before Russia was overwhelmed by Germany and Austria. In the reviewer's opinion, with offensive operations confined to the Eastern front, the Allies would still have won. Mr. McPherson seems habitually to underestimate the Russians, believing, for example, that Hindenburg struck them a mortal blow in 1915. Now the events of 1915, so disastrous to Russia, were inevitable when the war developed into a contest of munition manufacture; for Russia was not a manufacturing nation and was cut off from a ready supply by her allies. As it was, by 1916 Russia had turned every railway repair shop into a gun foundry or shell factory, and by the spring of 1917 there was in addition a plentiful stream of guns and ammunition flowing from her Allies. In the spring of 1917 there were nearly as many Russians mobilized as there were men among all the other Allies put together. What ruined Russia as a belligerent was the destruction of discipline in her army, and what destroyed discipline was revolution. When the revolution occurred the military outlook for Russia was excellent, far more excellent than it had been at any time during the previous two years. The Russian revolution might have occurred in peace times. It could not have occurred as it did, with great disciplined armies under the control of military chiefs, if these latter had understood the situation, and had not thought that they were acquiescing in a mere palace revolution intended to bring about a constitutional regime under another Romanoff sovereign. X. Y. Z.

Man and Mystic

William Blake the Man. By Charles Gardner. E. P. Dutton and Company.

NEARLY a century and a half ago the sapient Mr. Henry Mathew wrote an apologetic Advertisement to the Poetical Sketches of William Blake. To the Muses was printed in that collection. So was How Sweet I Roamed, and To the Evening Star. And the Reverend Mr. Mathew sponsored such songs with his tongue in his cheek! For the visions of Blake, however, the whirligig of time has, in the past fifty years, brought in ample and sweet revenges. Praise and understanding have come apace. For the stodgy and futile Hayleys and Stothards of the eighteenth century, blind to the real soul of Blake, the late nineteenth century has interpreted him through the poetic genius of Swinburne and Yeats. Patient study has yielded up the key to the "Prophetic Books," once regarded as chaotic ravings. They have been found to have a fairly consistent symbolic scheme which may be understood with little difficulty. Most of the later writers on Blake have stressed his unique modernity. It is not a false enthusiasm, either, that proclaims him as the precursor in certain respects of such rebels as Nietzsche, Butler, and Shaw. "The Proverbs of Hell," for instance, constitute a revolutionists' handbook as pungent in new points of view as "Man and Superman"; and in "The Visions of the Daughters of Albion," Blake analyzes self-love as mercilessly as Meredith does in "The Egoist." One can scarcely credit such a dynamic apparition as Blake among a generation to whom Dr. Johnson's horse-sense was neighing most ponderously and pontifically.

Mr. Gardner's "Blake the Man" is especially valuable for its emphasis on Blake's modern aspect. It traces his mental and spiritual growth, and presents a clear and plastic image of the man. Mr. Gardner has a pleasant and elastic style devoid of that deadly pedantry, that windy verbosity which is a familiar dry rot on the style of the learned in mysticism. His exposition is convincing because of his easy assurance, his humorous sense of proportion, and his thorough understanding of the men of Blake's circle and of the books in which Blake found profound affiliations and violent reactions. The personal influence in turn of Cromek and Flaxman, Stothard and Hayley, are commented upon in detail. Of the books that go far in explaining Blake, the most important is Swedenborg's "Angelic Wisdom Concerning the Divine Love." Mr. Gardner quotes marginal annotations from Blake's own copy of this work to show how Blake gradually diverged from his author's point of view as he discovered the rationalistic foundation of Swedenborg's supersensual world. "Thel" and "Tiriel," it is pointed out, were both written early under the influence of Swedenborg. "Thel" reflects the cloying sweetness and passivity so inimical to Blake's fundamental creed, but "Tiriel" in his contempt of the beautiful foreshadows Blake's revolt from the reasoned coldness of Swedenborg. "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell" is later quoted to reveal Blake's ultimate dissatisfaction with the Swedish mystic. What Blake found most admirable in Swedenborg was his devils. In their wonderful exuberance and energy they fitted into Blake's doctrine of obedience to energy and passion. The angels of Swedenborg's Heaven, on the other hand, were dull negations of the devil virtues—mere passive, spineless discoursers of theology. One can imagine Blake laughing sardonically as Swedenborg's devils peep into Heaven and then disgustedly plunge headforemost back into Hell. That portion of Mr. Gardner's book which deals with Blake's relations with Swedenborgian thought is exceedingly well done.

The much-misunderstood "Prophetic Books" are not analyzed in detail by Mr. Gardner, but their significance in the growth of Blake's thought is well suggested. Blake's central theme is shown to be the fall of man from a state of imaginative freedom into a muddy existence swayed by Reason and its attendant evils. Excerpts are taken from the "Jerusalem," the "Milton," and the "Four Zoas" to illustrate Blake's mature thought concerning deism, various theological dogmas, sex, and his symbolical view of Christ as the fierce apostle of energy and passion, as the embodiment of the creative imagination. The two great symbolical protagonists in the spiritual conflicts of the "Prophetic Books" are Los (Imagination) and Urizen (Reason). These wage hideous warfare in the soul of man, for since they have fallen out of the Divine Order there is no harmony between them. Blake engraved two awe-inspiring figures illustrating these two forces, and they are reproduced in this volume. As the "Prophetic Books" contain passages of rare beauty and power, it is to be hoped that Mr. Gardner's work will stimulate many to read poems generally ignored. The beautiful lament of Ahania in the "Book of Ahania" is one of many gems known only to Blake enthusiasts.

The engravings used as illustrations here are handsomely reproduced. One's only regret is that there are not more. The text is so interesting on the subject of Blake's and Stothard's engravings of The Canterbury Pilgrims that it would have been a happy thought to reproduce the two rival versions side by side. The famous engraving, The Ancient of Days, measuring out a new universe with vast compasses, is happily reproduced in all its impressive grandeur. The mention of it

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leads one back to Blake's modernity, for The Ancient of Days was engraved by Blake as a preface to "Europe, a Prophecy." The forces gathering for conflict in this poem and deluging the world with blood curiously foreshadow the war but lately ended; yet what irony attaches to the poem when one is drawn to read the peace of Versailles in the symbolical light of The Ancient of Days arriving after the gory tumult to mark out a new idealistic order for man!

GLEN MULLIN

Books in Brief

WHEN it comes to wearing armor soldiers would rather risk the ills they know not of than bear those they have already. In the sixteenth century they hastened the decline of armor by throwing it aside (or away) whenever they could; so in the twentieth the infantrymen of the Allies who had to march and charge under equipment weighing sixty pounds or more could not be convinced that additional pounds would be worth in protection what they would cost in effort. Moreover, the aesthetic element is larger than the layman guesses. Young soldiers resent an ugly helmet as young civilians resent an ugly hat. Not only the undeniable utility of the British-American "porridge-bowl" model commended it to its wearers but also its equally undeniable set and swing. It suited many faces. In the French helmet, with its jaunty crest and brim the most popular of helmets, utility and beauty most intimately met. This helmet was first adopted and least changed of all the types of armor used in the war. General Adrian designed it as a steel cap before December, 1914, and no less an artist than Edouard Detaille gave it its now classic form. That helmets were not the only forms of armor employed, or at least tested, during the World War appears from the admirable monograph on "Helmets and Body Armor in Modern Warfare" (Yale University Press) published for the Metropolitan Museum

Homer Folks'

NEW BOOK

THE HUMAN COSTS OF THE WAR

"Like Gibbs' *Now it Can Be Told,* and Keynes' *Economic Consequences of the Peace,"* says The Survey, "this is a book to be owned and read — and like them it is readable. Mr. Folks' subject is as important as theirs, and his competence is unquestionable. . . . What we have is not a succession of harrowing scenes, but the real explanation of what happened to the people."

Here is a book for every thinking man and woman who would take stock of the price humanity must pay for the madness of war.

Get it today from your bookseller, or fill out the coupon attached and mail to the publishers. The book is fully illustrated, cloth bound, and costs $2.25 net, or $2.40 postpaid.

HARPER & BROTHERS
Est. 1817
NEW YORK

CUT OUT THIS COUPON AND MAIL TODAY

N-1

HARPER & BROTHERS
Franklin Square
NEW YORK

I enclose $2.40 to cover all charges on my copy of

THE HUMAN COSTS OF THE WAR
By Homer Folks

.....

.....

.....

BRENTANO'S

Retail Book Department

Fifth Avenue and 27th Street, New York City

Reference Books for the Banker, Lawyer, Editor, Writer, etc.

Who's Who, 1920, in England
(Now ready) — Cloth, $15.00

An Annual Biographical Dictionary with which is incorporated "Men and Women of the Time."

Who's Who in America, 1920-21
(Ready early in July) — Probable price, $7.50

A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Living Men and Women of the United States.

Who's Who and Why in Canada, 1917-18
(Latest edition available) — Cloth, $6.00

A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Canadians.

The American Year Book
Cloth, $5.00

A Record of Events and Progress for 1919. Here, in one volume, is a complete digest of the events of interest to Americans that have taken place in business, politics, science, art, education, literature and every other field of human endeavor during the past year.

The China Year Book, 1919
Cloth, $9.00

A mine of information on all that appertains to that country.

The Japan Year Book, 1919-20
$5.00

Complete Cyclopaedia of Information and Statistics on Japan.

Exporters' Gazetteer of Foreign Markets, 1920-21
Edited by Lloyd R. Morris — Cloth, $10.00

The sort of analysis of the world's trade which every manufacturer, exporter, shipping man, economist, and banker should have.

Postage Additional

BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD

BRENTANO'S
Retail Book Department
Fifth Avenue and 27th Street
New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Art by Mr. Bashford Dean, Curator of Armor at the Museum and lately a major of ordnance in the American army. Authoritative as regards the British, French, and Americans, Mr. Dean at least glances at the other armies engaged, though in these directions much remains to be done. Within his field of special knowledge he has touched and illuminated almost every phase of the art and craft of the armorer ancient or modern. Rarely indeed has such historical erudition as Mr. Dean's been applied to a theme so recent and in most respects so businesslike.

"BOLSHEVISM AT WORK," by William T. Goode (Harcourt, Brace and Howe), employs the same method and covers about the same ground as Arthur Ransome's "Russia in 1919." By records of his interviews with Lenin and the principal commissars and by direct observation of a few industrial plants, Mr. Goode tries to suggest the impression of an energetically creative society working with confidence and imagination at the building of a well-planned structure. He has less difficulty in convincing the reader of the earnestness and the self-denying devotedness of Russia's present leaders than in proving the value of the work that has thus far been accomplished. It is clear that the writer approaches the Bolsheviki with unfavorable preconceptions and, finding their character and their conduct unlike what he had been led to expect, allowed himself to be carried too far in appreciation. We miss the guarded reserve which is discernible in an avowed sympathizer like Mr. Ransome, whose longer familiarity with the subject has taught him where to look for flaws. For all that he sees he is filled with admiration—for the workings of the political machinery, for the elaborate industrial organization, for the judiciary, for the system of education, for the cultivation of art, and the imperfections which he recognizes are no more serious than may be found in any system devised and operated by human fallibility. Experimental ideas and emergency programs are treated as if they already enjoyed the sanction of long trial. If we accepted Mr. Goode's version of the situation we should believe that the Bolsheviki are much nearer to realizing their original communist scheme for the control of the land and of industries and have a much firmer hold on the population than was claimed for them by Mr. Ransome. The six months which elapsed between Mr. Ransome's visit and Mr. Goode's were scarcely enough to produce such a difference in the state of things as to explain the discrepancy in their records. There can be little question of the latter's sincerity and freedom from bias, and there can be no ground for suspicion of political propaganda; but it is permissible to entertain some doubt about his critical sagacity.

THE need of a one-volume history of France in English, imperfectly supplied by such manuals as Mr. Cecil Headlam's "France," Professor George Burton Adams's "Growth of the French Nation," and the translations from French historians like Duruy, is met by Professor William Stearns Davis's "History of France from the Earliest Times to the Treaty of Versailles" (Houghton Mifflin). However admirable they may still be from certain standpoints, the pre-war histories treat in far too summary a fashion the period since 1815, relegating to one or two final chapters that century which is most important to the reader of today. To this period, with its many abrupt and perplexing changes of government, Professor Davis devotes a full third of his book, considering at length the tangled politics of the Third Republic, the development of the French colonial empire in Africa, and sketching briefly in his last chapter the course of the world war. Inferior to Adams's work in philosophic grasp, and making no pretence to original scholarship, the volume provides for the student and general reader not a military or diplomatic history but a history of the French people, full of those well-chosen and interesting details which a writer of successful historical romances and a high school history might be expected to recognize and include. As in the case of his text-book, "Mediaeval and Modern Europe," Professor Davis has worked with collaborators, entrusting in this case all the drudgery of scholarship, including the maps, the translations, the redaction of the text, the chronological table, the concise appendix on the Estates General, and the full and excellent critical bibliography of English books, to Miss Gertrude Jacobsen.

MR. GEORGE WHITEFIELD MEAD, author of "The Great Menace" (Dodd, Mead), thunders in the index of his little book and roars as gently as a dove in the appendix. He first calls upon us to place our heels on the Dragon of Bolshevism, then to dig him up by the roots, finally to exorcise him by the spirit of justice and brotherhood. The New York *Times* intones the curse and the Apostle Paul the benediction. And what is this great menace? Something which aims to produce in America conditions similar to those prevailing in Russia. What are conditions in Russia? Ask Mr. Hoover. He has not been there, it is true, but he knows that "the streets of every city and village have run with the blood of executions." Or ask the United States Senate Judiciary Committee on Bolshevism about the suppression of Sunday-schools and the desecration of Easter by the Bolsheviki. But for meticulous accuracy of detail consult the Minneapolis *Tribune*, and learn that "Russian Bolshevism, triumphant in this country, would be followed by the confiscation of 203,432 church edifices . . . and by atheist dictatorship domination over 41,926,854 church members." Some optimist who refuses to be "shocked out of a false sense of security" may continue to nurse the unconquerable hope that there is an overlooked 41,926,855th church member who will intrench himself in a possible 203,433d church edifice and hold the fort for Christianity. But that optimist must be made to see that he who does not share the Great Fear is himself a subtle agent of the Great Menace.

Fiction *Sociology* *History* *Belles-Lettres*

Open the Door CATHERINE CARSWELL
An English novel of unusual theme and quality. *$2.00*

Darkwater W. E. B. DU BOIS
The tragedy and aspiration of the Negro Race. *$2.00*

What the Workers Want ARTHUR GLEASON
The aims of British labor, told in the workers' own words. *$4.00*

An Introduction to Social Ethics JOHN M. MECKLIN
A study of the conscience of State acting upon social institutions. *$3.75*

A Short History of the Great War A. F. POLLARD
With 19 special maps that are marvels of clearness. *$3.25*

The New Unionism J. M. BUDISH *and* GEO. SOULE
The origin, structure, methods and program of the new type of unionism in the clothing industry. *$3.00*

A Guide to Russian Literature M. J. OLGIN
Great Russian writers from 1825 to 1917 sympathetically interpreted. *$3.00*

Musical Portraits PAUL ROSENFELD
Remarkable appreciations of 20 modern composers, from Wagner to Bloch. *$2.50*

HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE, 1 W. 47th ST. NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

HUNGARY

The War Record of Ex-Premier Huszar 110
Count Karolyi's Manifesto 110
The Political Results of the Hungarian Boycott 111
The Austrian Intellectuals on the Boycott 111

THE CRISIS IN SOUTH AMERICA

The Treaty of Ancon 112
The Truce Between Chile and Bolivia 113

The War Record of Ex-Premier Huszar

THE following deposition concerning the conduct of Charles Huszar, former Hungarian Premier, and his associates, is reprinted from *Az Ember* (Vienna) for June 6.

Affidavit: Taken on January 20, 1920, at Brasov (Brasso) before Colonel Vecerdea, Royal Rumanian Prefect of Police; Colonel John Neculea, Judge-Advocate; and Lieutenant Alexander Stefanescu, clerk.

Subject: Hungarian atrocities at Brasov, committed in 1916.

The deponents: Michael Russ, principal of a public school, and his companions relate as follows:

When on October 10, 1916, the Rumanian army evacuated Brasov, the city was entered, by order of the Hungarian Government, by a Hungarian intelligence detachment. The leaders of the detachment were First Lieutenant Arpy and Sergeant Charles Huszar, at present Premier of Hungary. The detachment consisted of 120 gendarmes and several secret service agents in civilian clothes. Immediately on their arrival, at night, they surrounded the so-called Bolgarszeg quarters of the city, driving the people out of their homes and corralling them on the Porond Square. Those refusing to hurry along were shot instantaneously. Thus the following were killed: Demetrius Mosoi, aged 52; John Lazar, 64; Theodor Farkasan, 58; Alexander Russ, 60; Nicholas Gavoi, 56; Mrs. Aspasia Ungurean, 36 (mother of four children); Alexander Popa, 50; Peter Vacar, 46 (a one-armed invalid); and a few others unidentified —in all, fourteen persons. The drive ended at 4 a. m. We were all lined up on the above-named square and interrogated one by one. The hearing, conducted by Lieutenant Arpy, consisted in taking down our names and addresses, and asking us the question: "What did you steal?" Woe unto those who said they did not steal anything! They were at once stripped naked and no matter whether it was a woman, man, or child, young or old, each received twenty-five blows with canes on the bare body. This terrible "hearing" lasted all day. Of course, everybody said in the end that he had stolen this or that, though all were innocent.

In the evening, in front of the Church of St. Nicholas, Sergeant Charles Huszar announced that he was going to have every one of us executed. He ordered some German troops in his command to prepare for the execution, and bade us to kneel down and say our prayers. We knelt down and awaited death, but at the last moment Major Öpitz, of the Commissariat, a humane Czech, arrived and told Huszar that the Heir-Apparent (the Archduke Charles) was expected to arrive next day and that he (Major Öpitz) declined responsibility for the proceedings. Thereupon Sergeant Charles Huszar became angered to such extent that he fired his rifle point blank into the crowd. By accident he did not hit anybody. Thereupon all the male prisoners were driven into the Church of St. Nicholas and there flogged into insensibility. The deponent, Michael Russ, principal of a public school, was beaten by Charles Huszar himself, who used the butt of his rifle. There is no end to the atrocities committed by these two bestial men (Arpy and Huszar) in the counties of Brasov and Haromszek. The so-called K-Stelle was located in the Brasov School of the lumber industry, the prison in the cellar and the citadel. Here the following were executed: Basil Muntyan, Damian Nistov, Denis Procan, and John Caluger, all priests. The merchant Eremia was flogged till he became insane. In the casemates of this citadel hundreds of corpses lay about unburied. We request that the depositions of the following be taken: former Sergeant of Gendarmes Csepes and Private Anthony Gregor. They were members of the detachment, but became so disgusted with the horrors that they deserted. At present Csepes is domiciled at Petrocile 32, Brasov.

Count Karolyi's Manifesto

THE following manifesto of Count Michael Karolyi, at present living in exile in Czecho-Slovakia, is reprinted from *Az Ember* (Vienna) for April 3.

TO THE ENSLAVED HUNGARIANS:

There is no hour of the day but that my thoughts dwell with you, my imprisoned, downtrodden, tortured brethren.

Tears burst into my eyes, my fists clench with rage whenever I think of the crimes committed against you. To know that the number of innocent victims increases day by day; to know that we in our enforced exile cannot rush to your aid and smite down your executioners is unbearable.

Hungary today is a great death chamber. Under the guise of Christianity, with the catchword of neighborly love, the system on which rests the guilt of five years' war has been revived. The darkest pages of medieval history, with their vaults of torture, are repeated.

During the war clericalism, that henchman of rapacious militarism, pronounced its blessing on the cannon. Today, with crucifix in hand, robed in the surplice, it blesses the thumbscrews of the Awakening Hungarians and unites with the murderers who have massacred hundreds of innocent people at Kecskemet and elsewhere.

But the reign of the Magyar Torquemada cannot last much longer. That edifice of lies and sham slogans must crumble. We who live abroad cannot preach to you war and rebellion, however justified. We know only too well the fate of those who, loyal to their principles, refuse to bend their knees before the Terror. Yet we wish to inspire strength, courage, and faith in the souls of the despairing, of those who in their terrible visitation have lost trust in the final victory.

You who in the internment camps of Hajmasker, in the prisons of Budapest and other parts of Hungary endure unspeakable torment of the body and soul—may your faith live strong and unshakable. We homeless exiles shall not forget you; we shall do whatever little we can to enlighten the conscience of the world, to stir humanity to active protest against the Hungarian horrors.

All the frantic efforts of the reactionaries cannot drown the voices that rise, as from Dante's Inferno, from the hosts of nameless heroes in their mortal agony. As we hear those voices, so does the world, this new world struggling onward on the road of progress. Every blow is echoed, every drop of blood will bear its fruit a hundredfold.

Only on the road of suffering and trial does man find his better self, does he discover in the depth of his soul the strength that otherwise may have remained hidden forever. Reformers, messengers of a new faith, have been persecuted everywhere, in all ages; yes, by the blood of martyrs the Idea always triumphs. It is you who lend us strength to struggle on. And whenever our hour of trial shall strike, it will be your example that will enable us to bear our cross.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the time will come when the scourge drives the publicans and Pharisees out of the House of God. May this thought, the faith in a regenerated humanity, live in you.

Your sufferings, your spilt blood will be the brick and mortar of the Socialist world, built on the rock of true brotherhood, the Gospel's kingdom of the poor of today. Workers of Hungary, my enslaved brethren, however hard it all may seem, remember the words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

Signed: MICHAEL KAROLYI

The Political Results of the Hungarian Boycott

THE announcement on June 4 of the International Trade Union Federation that an embargo on all communication with Hungary would be put into effect on June 20, created great consternation in political circles at Budapest. On June 5 the existence of the White Terror was for the first time admitted on the floor of the National Assembly. In a secret session Deputy Hencz, a Christian Nationalist, exposed the abortive plan of the officers of the Hejjas and Ostenburg detachments and the Society of Awakening Hungarians to overthrow the Assembly and proclaim a military dictatorship.

For the first time Lieutenant Hejjas and Count Ostenburg were denounced by name, and their punishment was demanded even by supporters of the Government. One of the speakers was Count Albert Apponyi, the veteran conservative statesman, who said, in part:

Let us call a spade a spade. The atrocities are committed, not by civilians disguised as officers, but by genuine officers who are not worthy of the name. Officers' gangs commit one revolting murder after the other with bestial cruelty. This sort of thing must be stopped if the country is not to be ruined.

Measures to combat the Terror were discussed in subsequent meetings, spokesmen of the Government persisting in the stand that the excesses were committed by "irresponsible elements" masquerading as officers. On June 13 the *Official Gazette* promulgated a decree, signed by the Minister of Defense, General Soos, purporting to dissolve the "detachments" and to prohibit interference with civilians by members of the armed force. On this decree *Becsi Magyar Ujsag* (a Vienna Hungarian paper, organ of the non-socialist radical refugees) comments editorially as follows in the issue of June 15:

We have read carefully the text of this order, as transmitted in official dispatches, and we declare on our honor and conscience this order means that everything remains unchanged.

The Budapest correspondent of the newspaper transmits the following text of the decree:

All activities of all military formations, of agents of the armed force, and of detachments and their investigators, must cease in matters pertaining to civilians. These formations will henceforth be incorporated in the organization of military justice. Military authorities and their subordinate officials may proceed against civilians only in cases arising from crimes against the military force of the state. Confiscations, and the searching of persons and homes, may even in such cases be carried out only on written warrants issued by the military commander in charge. Exception to this rule obtains in cases where civilians are caught in a criminal act; but civilians thus arrested must within forty-eight hours be arraigned before the (military) judge-advocate of the district. During the period of transition, pending the enactment of laws restoring political and social order, military authorities and their organs must limit themselves to proceedings undertaken at the request of the civil authority concerned, and in cases brought to the knowledge of the military authority all evidence must be submitted to the civil authority concerned. Those military officials and investigators who abuse their power by transgressing the above regulations, must be arrested at once and turned over to the nearest military authority.

Analyzing this decree *Becsi Magyar Ujsag* points out that (1) the incorporation of the "detachments" into the National Army means absolutely no change, as the most dreaded units, the Pronay and Ostenburg detachments, are already so incorporated as the Third and Twenty-sixth Chasseur Battalions respectively; (2) that "for a period of transition" the power of the military organs remains unaffected; (3) that the military may arrest anybody charged with an offense against the army, such offenses to be defined by the military themselves; (4) that military officers transgressing the regulation will be dealt with by the military authorities themselves. The paper continues:

We ask: Of the hundreds of atrocities enumerated by the British Labor Party report how many would not be repeated because of this decree? Not one; and if the boycott had not been declared already, it ought to be declared now, and continued until somebody other than Horthy will issue decrees against Horthy. *Ceterum censemus Horthyculturam esse delendam.*

Ernest Garami, leader of the Right Wing of the Hungarian Social Democratic Party, who went into exile at the establishment of Bela Kun's Government, comments in *Az Ember* for June 20 as follows:

There is no change in the Hungarian situation. The change is merely in the tactics of the Government. So far the Government has denied the existence of the White Terror; from now on it merely disclaims responsibility for it.

In the same issue of *Az Ember* its editor, Frank Göndör, writes:

What the Hungarian Government, with the cooperation of Herr Apponyi, is trying to put over now is nothing but humbug of the most impudent sort. . . . A more murderous, a more rabid terror is raging in Hungary now than ever before. . . . It is not true that Horthy, the cabinet, and the National Assembly are in earnest about abolishing the Terror. What they want is not abolition of the Terror. What they want is merely to make Europe believe that there is no Terror. . . . Nobody ought to expect that the regent of the White Terror would abolish the foundation of his very existence, the bloody rule of the Terror.

The Austrian Intellectuals on the Boycott

THE Free Association of the Cultural Societies of German-Austria has transmitted the following document to the Executive Committee of the International Trade Union Federation at Amsterdam. The document was published in *Becsi Magyar Ujsag* (Vienna) on June 17. It is signed by William Börner, an exponent of contemporary German philosophy.

It is with the deepest horror and stupefaction that we observe the atrocities the responsibility for which rests on the present Hungarian Government. Our Federation, which has for its aim the advancement of intellectual and moral culture, regards those deeds as such an incredible deviation from the principles of humanity that we learn with satisfaction the announcement of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the international boycott against Hungary. The Hungarian Government must see that every class of the peoples of all civilized countries is prepared to sever all connection with a country whose political leaders trample upon the precepts of humanity in such a brutal manner. We are aware that the boycott will gravely affect the innocent, and we profoundly regret this sad phase of it. Nevertheless we are convinced that, unlike the blockade of wartime, the present embargo is justified by events. It means stigmatizing a country which, with the connivance and often even with the encouragement of its government, indulges in acts at the sight of which civilized beings of the twentieth century cover their faces in shame. This boycott rests on facts; for in what other manner would it be possible to bring to its senses an inhumane government except by severing all relations with it, isolating it, and switching it outside of the circuit of civilized life? Although the boycott is enforced by the class-conscious proletariat of all countries and is intended to benefit the Hungarian proletariat first of all, we wish to give expression to the fact that here in Austria many men and women, regardless of party ties and viewpoints, greet with enthusiasm your course in the name of human solidarity and transmit to you their heartfelt thanks for organizing this epoch-making action. We hope that your well-planned intervention will soon achieve the desired and hoped-for result.

Signed: WILHELM BÖRNER,
For the Free Federation of the Cultural Societies of German-Austria.

The Treaty of Ancon

THE Treaty of Ancon, on the basis of which Chile still hopes to settle the question of Tacna and Arica now disturbing the peace of South America, was signed in 1883.

The Republic of Chile on the one part, and the Republic of Peru on the other, wishing to reestablish friendly relations between the two nations, have determined to celebrate a treaty of peace and friendship, and with this object have named and appointed their plenipotentiaries, namely:

His Excellency the President of Chile appoints Mr. Jovino Novoa, and his Excellency the President of Peru appoints Mr. José Antonio Lavalle, Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Mariano Castro Zaldivar.

The above mentioned, after having shown their full powers and authority, and finding them in due and correct form, have agreed on the following articles:

ARTICLE 1. Relations of peace and friendship are reestablished between the Republics of Chile and Peru.

ARTICLE 2. The Republic of Peru cedes to the Republic of Chile, perpetually and unconditionally, the territory of the coast province of Tarapaca, the limits of which are: on the north the valley and river of Camarones, on the south the valley and river of Loa, on the east the Republic of Bolivia, and on the west the Pacific Ocean.

ARTICLE 3. The territory of the provinces of Tacna and Arica, limited on the north by the River Sama, from its origin in the Andes, conterminous with Bolivia, to its mouth, where it flows into the Pacific Ocean, on the south by the valley and river of Camarones, on the east by the Republic of Bolivia and on the west by the Pacific Ocean, shall remain in the possession of Chile, subject to the laws and authorities of Chile during the term of ten years, to be counted from the date of the ratification of the present treaty of peace. This term having expired a plebiscite shall decide by popular vote if the territory of these provinces shall remain definitely under the dominion and sovereignty of Chile or if they shall continue forming part of the territory of Peru. That one of the two countries in whose favor the provinces of Tacna and Arica shall be annexed, shall pay to the other ten million dollars Chilian silver money or Peruvian *soles*, of equal percentage of fine silver and also of equal weight as the former.

A special protocol, which shall be considered as an integral part of the present treaty, shall establish the form in which the plebiscite shall take place, and the terms and conditions on which the ten million dollars shall be paid, by the nation that remains in possession of the provinces of Tacna and Arica.

ARTICLE 4. In conformity with the disposition of the supreme decree of February 9, 1882, by which the Government of Chile authorized the sale of a million tons of guano, the net product of this substance, after deducting all expenses, as referred to in Article 13 of that decree, shall be divided in equal parts between the Government of Chile and the creditors of Peru, whose titles of credit appear to be based on the security of guano.

On the termination of the sale of the million tons, referred to in the anterior clause, the Government of Chile will continue delivering to the creditors of Peru the 50 per cent of the net proceeds of guano sold, as established in Article 13, until the debt is totally paid or the guano deposits in actual working are exhausted.

The product of the deposits that may be discovered in the future in the territories ceded to Chile belong exclusively to the Chilian government.

ARTICLE 5. If deposits of guano be discovered in the territories that remain under the dominion of Peru, in order to avoid competition in the sale of this substance, both Governments, of common accord, shall previously determine the proportions and conditions under which each of them shall dispose of this manure.

The stipulation made in the preceding clause shall also refer to the existence of guano already discovered, that may remain on Lobos Islands, at the time of the delivery of these islands to Peru, in conformity with Article 9 of the present treaty.

ARTICLE 6. The creditors of Peru, to whom are conceded the advantages referred to in Article 4, shall submit, for the qualification of their titles and for other proceedings, to the reglamentation established by the supreme decree of February 9, 1882.

ARTICLE 7. The obligation that the Government of Chile accepts by Article 4 of delivering 50 per cent of the net product of guano of the deposits actually working, shall subsist, if this extraction takes place in conformity with the existing contract based upon the sale of one million tons, or if it be effected in virtue of another contract, for the exclusive account of the Government of Chile.

ARTICLE 8. Except in virtue of the declarations specified in the preceding articles and of the obligations that the Government of Chile has voluntarily accepted in the supreme decree of March 28, 1882, that regulates the nitrate property of Tarapaca, the aforesaid Government of Chile will recognize no credits of any class that affect the new territories acquired by the present treaty, whatever may be their nature and antecedents.

ARTICLE 9. The Lobos Islands will continue to be administered by the Government of Chile until the existing guano deposits have furnished one million tons of guano, as stipulated in Article 4 and Article 7. When the million tons have been extracted the islands shall be returned to Peru.

ARTICLE 10. The Government of Chile declares that there shall be ceded to Peru, from the day that the present treaty shall be ratified and constitutionally exchanged, the 50 per cent appertaining to that Republic from the product of guano from Lobos Islands.

ARTICLE 11. While no special treaty is made, the mercantile relations between the two countries shall subsist in the same state that they were before April 5, 1879.

ARTICLE 12. The indemnity owing by Peru to Chilians who have suffered damages on account of the war, shall be determined by a tribunal of arbitration, or by an international mixed commission, immediately after the ratification of the present treaty, in the form established for the conventions re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cently agreed upon between Chile and the Governments of England, France, and Italy.

ARTICLE 13. The contracting governments recognize and accept the validity of all administrative acts and judicial sentences made and passed during the occupation of Peru, derived from martial law exercised by the Government of Chile.

ARTICLE 14. The present treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications exchanged in the city of Lima as soon as possible, within a maximum period of one hundred and sixty days, counting from this date. . . .

Dated at Lima the twentieth of October of the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty three.

Signed: JOVINO NOVOA
J. A. LAVALLE
MARIANO CASTRO ZALDIVAR

The Truce Between Chile and Bolivia

THE following "pact of truce" between Chile and Bolivia was signed on April 4, 1884, and made over into a treaty in 1904. In view of the present Bolivian crisis its provisions are of particular interest.

I

The Republics of Chile and Bolivia celebrate an indefinite truce, and, in consequence, they declare the state of war terminated, and that the same cannot be again carried on unless one of the contracting parties notifies the other, with at least one year of anticipation, its determination to resume hostilities. In this case the notification shall be made directly, or through the diplomatic representative of a friendly nation.

II

The Republic of Chile, during the period that this treaty is in force, shall continue to govern according to Chilian law the territories situated between the parallel 23 degrees south and the mouth of the River Loa, these territories being bounded to the east by a right line, drawn from Zapalegui, from the intersection of the limit of the Argentine Republic to the volcano Licancaur. From this point it follows a right line to the summit of the extinct volcano Cabana; from there continues another right line to the spring of water (*ojo de aqua*) that is found to the south of Lake Ascotan; and from there another right line that, cutting by the side of the lake, terminates on the volcano Ollagua. From this point another right line to the volcano Tua afterwards follows the divisional line between Tarapaca and Bolivia.

In case difficulties may arise, both parties shall point a commission of engineers that shall fix the limits as indicated, subject to the landmarks here determined.

III

The property and goods confiscated from Chilian citizens by Government edict or by order of civil and military authorities shall be immediately returned to their owners or to their representatives.

There shall also be returned the products that the Government of Bolivia may have received from these properties and that appear to be proved by the documents in the case.

The damages that in these cases have been suffered by Chilian citizens shall be indemnified by reason of the actions that the interested parties may bring before the Government of Bolivia.

IV

If no agreement can be arrived at between the Government of Bolivia and the parties interested with respect to the amount of indemnity for the loss and damage suffered, the points in dispute shall be submitted to a commission of arbitration composed of three members, one named by Chile, one by Bolivia, and the third to be named in Chile, by mutual accord, from among the representatives of neutral nations resident in Chile. This commission shall be appointed as soon as possible.

V

Commercial relations shall be reestablished between Chile and Bolivia.

In future raw material produced in Chile, and articles manufactured there, shall enter Bolivia free from all duties, or customs-house dues; and Bolivian productions of the same class and fabricated in the same way shall enjoy the same freedom in Chile, on their importation or exportation through a Chilian port.

The commercial freedom of Chilian and Bolivian manufactures, as well as the enumeration of these said products, shall form matter for a special protocol.

Nationalized merchandise entering by the port of Arica shall be considered as foreign merchandise for the effects of its entry.

Foreign merchandise introduced into Bolivia via Antofagasta shall have free passage, notwithstanding such measures as Chile may take to prevent contraband trade.

Until a special convention is made, Chile and Bolivia shall enjoy the commercial advantages and freedom that either nation accords to the most favored nation.

VI

At the port of Arica foreign merchandise, even that entering for consumption in Bolivia, shall pay the customs dues in force by the Chilian tariff; this merchandise shall not pay, in the interior, any further duty. The sums received in payment of duty shall be divided in this way: 25 per cent shall be applied as dues received for merchandise to be consumed in the territories of Tacna and Arica, and as working expenses, and 75 per cent shall be for Bolivia.

This 75 per cent shall be divided, at present, in the following way: 40 parts shall be retained by the Chilian administration to pay the sums owed by Bolivia, as the settlement of the amounts, to be executed according to Clause III of this treaty and to pay the unsettled part of the Bolivian loan raised in Chile in 1867; the remainder shall be handed over to the Bolivian Government in cash or in drafts at its order. The loan shall be considered, for the effecting of its payment, as on equal terms with the damages to personal property effected during the war.

The Bolivian Government, when it thinks proper, is at liberty to examine the accounts of the Arica customs-house, by means of its agents.

As soon as the indemnity specified in Article 3 has been paid, and the retention of the 40 parts therefore ceases, Bolivia is at liberty to establish customs-houses in the interior of her territory, if it be thought fit. In this case foreign merchandise may pass free, via Arica.

VII

Any acts of the subordinate authorities of either nation that tend to alter the situation formed by the present treaty of truce, especially in what may refer to the limits that Chile continues to occupy, shall be repressed and punished by the respective Governments, officially or by request.

VIII

As the object of the contracting parties in celebrating this pact of truce, is to prepare and facilitate a solid and stable treaty of peace between the two republics, they reciprocally promise to act in a manner conducive to this end.

This pact shall be ratified by the Government of Bolivia within forty days, and the ratifications exchanged at Santiago during the month of June. . . .

Signed: A. VERGARA ALBANO
BELISARIO SALINAS
BELISARIO BOETO

That which was stipulated having been complied with in a complementary protocol, the ratifications of this treaty were exchanged at Santiago, on November 29 of the same year, 1884.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How are you going to vote?

In voting for the next President of the United States, the people assume a new burden of responsibility—the result of issues which have been forced upon a creaking and exhausted world.

No election has ever been more important than the one which will take place next November—and no election has been more confused.

THE NATION, between now and November, will publish the truth about all the candidates. Many of the facts published will be astounding and all of them will be fair and absolutely free of party bias.

You need THE NATION to help you make your decision. You can have it every week for the next six months for $2.50. Send your remittance at once, and in acknowledgment of your support we will include free a copy of H. N. Brailsford's "The Covenant of Peace"—the essay which was awarded a prize of £100 by a distinguished jury as being the best short study of a league of nations.

The Nation,
20 Vesey Street,
New York, N. Y.

Inclosed herewith you will find remittance for $2.50, for which please send me THE NATION for six months, together with H. N. Brailsford's "The Covenant of Peace."

Name .....

Address ..... City ..... State 7-24

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED